Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE
DISTINCTIO XIII.
Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 228-229.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Cap. I.

Quare Spiritus sanctus, cum sit de substantia Patris, non dicatur genitus, sed tantum procedens.

Post haec[1] considerandum est, quantum a talibus, quales nos sumus, intelligi potest, cum Spiritus sanctus procedat de Patre et sit de substantia Patris, cur non dicatur esse natus, sed potius procedere; et cur non dicatur filius. Quare autem Spiritus sanctus non dicatur vel sit natus, et ideo non sit filius, Augustinus ostendit in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[2] ita dicens: « Si Spiritus sanctus filius diceretur, amborum utique Filius diceretur, quod asurdissimum est. Filius quippe nullus est duorum nisi patris et matris. Absit autem, ut inter Deum Patrem et Deum Filium tale aliquid suspicemur ». Absurdissime ergo filius diceretur amborum, id est Patris et Filii. « Amborum enim filius diceretur, si eum ambo genuissent, quod abhorret omnium sanorum sensus. Non igitur ab utroque est genitus, sed procedit ab utroque amborum Spiritus ».[3] His verbis ostenditur, cur Spiritus, cum sit de Patre, non tamen dicatur genitus vel filius.

Cap. II.

Cur Filius dicatur procedere, cum Spiritus sanctus non dicatur gigni.

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD
DISTINCTION 13
Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 228-239.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Chapter I

For what reason is the Holy Spirit, since he is from the Substance of the Father, not said (to be) begotten, but only proceeding.

After these (considerations)[1] there must be considered, as much as there can be understood by such as we are, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from [de] the Father and is from the Substance of the Father, why He is not said to have been born, but rather to proceede; and why He is not said (to be) a son. Moreover, the reason why [quare] the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) and/or has not been born, and for that reason is not "a son", (St.) Augustine shows in the fifteenth book <u>On the Trinity</u>,[2] speaking thus: « If the Holy Spirit would be said (to be) "a son", Both would certainly be said (to be) "The Son", which is most absurd. Indeed no "son" belongs to two except to a father and a mother. Moreover, far be it, that between God the Father and God the Son we suspect anything of the kind [tale aliquid] ». Therefore most absurdly would "son" be said of Both, if Both had begotten Him, which (argument) the sense of all sane (men) abhors. Therefore the Spirit has not been begotten by Each, but proceeds from Each of the Two [a utroque amborum] ».[3] With these words there is shown, why the Spirit, since He is from [de] the Father, is not, however, said (to be) begotten and/or "a son".

Chapter II

Why is the Son said to proceed, when the Holy Spirit is not said to be begotten?

Cum autem Spiritus sanctus non dicatur genitus, sed tantum procedens, quaeri solet, cur Filius non dicitur tantum genitus, sed et procedens, sicut ipse in Evangelio Ioannis[4] ait: *Ego ex Deo processi vel exivi, et veni in mundum*. Non ergo tantum Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre, sed etiam Filius. Ad quod dicimus, quod cum uterque procedat a Patre, dissimiliter tamen. Nam « Spiritus sanctus, ut ait Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate,[5] procedit a Patre non quomodo natus, sed quomodo datus » vel Donum. Filius autem processit nascendo, exiit ut genitus. Ac per hoc illud elucescit, ut potest, scilicet cur Spiritus sanctus etiam non sit filius, cum et ipse a Patre exeat, « ideo scilicet[6] non dicitur filius, quia neque natus est, sicut Unigenitus, neque factus, ut per Dei gratiam in adoptionem nasceretur, sicut nos ».

Moreover, since the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) begotten, but only proceeding, it is customarily asked [quare solet], why the Son is not said only (to be) born, but also proceeding, just as He Himself says in the Gospel of (St.) John:[4] *I have proceeded out of* and/or *have come forth from God, and I have come into the world*. Therefore not only does the Holy Spirit proceed from [a] the Father, but the Son (does) too. To which we say, that though Each proceeds from the Father, however (They do so) dissimilarly. For « the Holy Spirit », as (St.) Augustine says in the fifteenth book <u>On the Trinity</u>,[5] « proceeds from the Father not in the manner which (one is) born, but in the manner which (one is) given » and/or (as) the Gift. Moreover, the Son has proceeded by being born, He has come forth as the Begotten. And through this, there glitters that, as (much as) it can, that is, 'why the Holy Spirit is not also a son, since he also comes forth from the Father', « for this reason, namely[6] 'He is not said (to be) "a son", because neither has He been born, as the Only-Begotten (has), nor made, as one (who) through the grace of God has been born unto adoption, as we (are)' ».

Cap. III.

Quod non potest mortalis distinguere inter generationem Filii et processionem Spiritus sancti.

Inter generationem vero Filii et processionem Spiritus sancti, dum hic vivimus, distinguere non sufficimus. Unde Augustinus Maximino praemissam quaestionem refricanti, scilicet quaerenti, cur Spiritus sanctus non diceretur filius, cum de Patris esset substantia, respondens sic ait:[7] « Quaeris a me, si de substantia Patris et Filius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus sanctus, cur unus filius sit, et alius non sit filius. Ecce respondeo, sive capias sive non capias: de Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus sanctus, sed ille genitus est, iste procedens; ideo ille Filius est Patris, de quo est genitus; iste autem Spiritus est utriusque, quoniam de utroque procedit. Sed ideo, cum de illo loqueretur, ait:[8] *De Patre procedit*, quoniam Pater processionis eius est auctor, qui talem Filium genuit et gignendo ei dedit, ut etiam de ipso procederet Spiritus sanctus. Nam nisi

Chapter III

That a mortal cannot distinguish between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Sprit.

On the other hand, while we live here, we are not sufficient to distinguish between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit. Whence (St.) Augustine responding thus to Maximinus, warming up again [refricanti] the aforementioned question, that is, asking, why the Holy Spirit was not said (to be) "a son", since He was from [de] the Substance of the Father, says:[7] « You ask from me, if the Holy Spirit is from the Substance of the Father and the Son is also from the Substance of the Father, why is One a "son", and the Other is not a "son". Behold, I respond, whether you grasp it or do not grasp it: the Son is from the Father, the Holy Spirit is from the Father, but the Former has been begotten, that (Spirit) of Theirs (is) proceeding; for that reason that Son is of the Father, from whom He has been begotten; but that Spirit of Theirs is of Each, since He proceeds from

procederet etiam de ipso, non diceret discipulis:[9] *Accipite Spiritus sanctum*, eumque insufflando daret, ut a se quoque procedere significans, aperte ostenderet flando, quod spirando dabat occulte. Quia ergo, si nasceretur, non tantum de Patre nec tantum de Filio, sed de ambobus utique nasceretur; sine dubio filius diceretur amborum. Ac per hoc, quia filius amborum nullo modo esset, non oportuit nasci eum de ambobus. Amborum est ergo Spiritus,[10] procedendo de ambobus ».

« Quid autem inter nasci et procedere intersit, de illa excellentissima natura loquens explicare quis potest? Non[11] omne quod procedit, nascitur, quamvis omne procedat, quod nascitur; sicut non omne quod bipes est, homo est, quamvis bipes sit omnis, qui homo est. Hoc scio; distinguere autem inter illam generationem et hanc processionem nescio, non valeo, non sufficio. Ac per hoc, quia et illa et ista est ineffabilis sicut Propheta de Filio loquens ait:[12] *Generationem eius quis ennarabit?* ita de Spiritu sancto verissime dicitur: processionem eius quis enarrabit? Satis sit ergo nobis quia non est a se ipso Filius, sed ab illo de quo natus est, non est a se ipso Spiritus sanctus, sed ab illo de quo procedit, et quia de utroque procedit, sicut iam ostendimus ».[13] De Spiritu sancto, quomodo ipse de . . .

Each. But for that reason, when (the Former) speaks of the Latter, He says:[8] *proceeds from the Father*, since the Father is the Author of His procession, which (Father) begot such a Son and by begetting gave to Him, that the Holy Spirit would also proceed from Him. For if He did not proceed from Him also, He would not have said to the Disciples:[9] *Accept the Holy Spirit*, and would (not) by breathing upon (them) given Him, as One signifying that He also proceeds from Himself, (nor) would He have openly shown by exhaling [flando], that by spirating He was giving (Him) in a secret manner. Therefore, because, if He were born, not only from the Father nor only from the Son, but from Both He would indeed be born; would without doubt be said (to be) the "son" of Both. And through this, because in no manner is he the son of Both, it was not opportune that He be born from Both. Therefore the Spirit[10] is of Both, by proceeding from Both ».

« Moreover, what intervenes [intersit] between "being born" and "proceeding", speaking of that most excellent Nature, who can explain? Not[11] everything which proceeds, is born, although everything proceeds, because it is born; just as not everything which is a biped, is a man, although everyone, who is a man, is a biped. This I know; but how to distinguish between that generation and this procession I know not, nor am I able, nor do I suffice. And through this, that both this and that are ineffable, just as the Prophet, speaking of the Son, says:[12] *His generation, who will tell it forth?* such that of the Holy Spirit there is most truly said: His procession, who will tell it forth? Therefore, it is sufficient for us that the Son is not from [a] Himself, but from Him from [de] whom He has been born, the Holy Spirit is not from [a] Himself, but from Him from [de] whom He proceeds, and that He proceeds from Each, just as we have already shown ».[13] Concerning the Holy Spirit, in what manner He Himself be . . .

---

[1] Ed. 1 sola *hoc*.
[2] Cap. 27. n. 48, et Tract. 99. in Ioan. n. 9. — Etiam verba praecedentia secundum sensum ex eodem loco excerpta sunt. — Post *Trinitate* Vat. et ed.. 4, 8 omittunt *ita*; in fine loci codd. A C D *suspicetur* pro *suspicemur*.

[1] Edition 1 alone has *this* [hoc].
[2] Chapter 27, n. 48, and On the Gospel of John, Tract 99, n. 9. — Even the preceding words, according to their sense, have been excerpted from the same passage. — After *Trinity* [Trinitate], the Vatican edition and editions 4 and 8, omit *thus* [ita]; at the

[3] August., ibid. c. 26. n. 47, in quo loco sola Vat. post *ambo* perperam addit *et*. Deinde cod. B cum Augustino habet *ab omnium sanorum sensibus*. Denique contra Augustinum et omnes mss. legunt edd. *Non ergo* pro *Non igitur*.
[4] Cap16, 27. et 28. Vulgata *Ego a Deo exivi. Exivi a Patre et veni in mundum*. Sed Ioan. 8, 42 legitur: *ex Deo processi*; unde Magister dicit : *processi vel exivi*.
[5] Cap. 14. n. 15, unde et sumta sunt quae post interposita verba Magisteri sequuntur.
[6] Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 8 *Spiritus* pro *scilicet*. Mox cod. C verbo *natus est* praemittit *ipse*.
[7] Libr. II. c. 14. n. 1; in quo loco edd. 1, 8 indebite omittunt *sit* ante *et alius*. Mox ante *Spiritus sanctus* solummodo codd. A C addunt *etiam*.
[8] Ioan. 15, 26; Vulgata *a Patre procedit*. — Paulo ante sola ed. 1 cum originali omittit *est* ante *utriusque*.
[9] Ioan. 20, 22.
[10] Contradicentibus mss., ed 1 et textu Augustini, Vat. cum aliis edd. addit *sanctus*.
[11] Ed. 1 adiungit *enim*, et paulo infra post *illam* addit *Verbi*.
[12] Isai. 53, 8.
[13] Loc. cit. — Paulo infra ed. 5 *ipse Deus sit de Deo* pro *ipse de Deo sit*.

end of the passage, codices A C and D have *there be suspected* [suspicetur] for *we suspect* [suspicemur].
[3] (St.) Augustine, ibid., ch. 26, n. 47, in which passage on the Vatican edition after *if both* [si . . . ambo] faultily adds *also* [et]. Then codex B together with (St.) Augustine's text has *by the senses of all sane men* [ab omnium sanorum sensibus]. Then contrary to (St.) Augustine and all the manuscripts, the editions read *Therefore* [ergo] for *Therefore* [igitur].
[4] Jn 16:27, 28. The Vulgate has *I have come forth from God. I have come forth from the Father and I have come into the world*. [Ego a Deo exivi. Exivi a Patre et veni in mundum.] But John 8:42 reads: *out of God have I proceeded* [ex Deo processi]; whence Master (Peter) says: *I have proceeded and/or have come forth* [processi vel exivi].
[5] Chapter 14, n. 15, whence have also been taken those which follow the interposed words of Master (Peter).
[6] The Vatican edition and editions 4, 5, 6 and 8, have '*the Spirit* [Spiritus] in place of *namely 'He*. Then codex C has *has He Himself been born* [ipse natus est].
[7] Book II, ch. 14, n. 1; in which passage editions 1 and 8 unduly omit after the first why [cur] the first *is* [est]. Next at *Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sanctus] only codices A and C add *also* [etiam].
[8] Jn. 15:26; the Vulgate reads *proceeds from the Father* [a Patre procedit]. — A little before this only edition 1 together with the original omits *is* [est] before *of Each* [utriusque].
[9] Jn. 20:22.
[10] Contradicting the manuscripts, edition 1 and the text of (St.) Augustine, the Vatican edition, together with the other editions, adds *Holy* [sanctus].
[11] Edition 1 inserts *For* [enim], and a little below this in *that generation* [illam generationem], inserts *of the Word* [Verbi].
[12] Isaiah 53:8.
[13] Loc. cit.. — In the text at the end of the page, passing over into the next, edition 5 has *God Himself be from God* [ipse Deus sit de Deo] for *He Himself be from God* [ipse de Deo sit].

---

p. 229

Deo sit, nec tamen ipse filius sit, quoniam procedendo, non nascendo legitur esse de Deo, iam superius, quantum visum est, disputavimus.

from [de] God, and yet He is not a son, since is it read that He is from God by proceeding, not by being born, we have disputed above already, as much as has been seen.

Cap. IV.

Utrum Spiritus sanctu debeat dici ingenitus, cum non sit genitus.

Nunc considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus non sit genitus, utrum debeat dici ingenitus. Ad quod dicimus, Spiritum sanctum nec genitum nec ingenitum debere

Chapter IV

Whether the Holy Spirit ought to be said (to be) unbegotten, since He is not begotten.

Now there must be considered, since the Holy Spirit has not been begotten, whether He ought to be said (to be) unbegotten. To which we say, that the Holy Spirit ought to

dici. Unde Augustinus ad Orosium[1] ait: « Spiritum sanctum nec genitum nec ingenitum fides certa declarat; quia si dixerimus ingenitum, duos patres affirmare videbimur; si autem genitum, duos filios credere culpamur ». Sicut enim solus filius dicitur genitus, ita et solus Pater dicitur ingenitus, eo quod a alio non sit. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate:[2] « Pater, inquit, solus non est de alio, ideo solus appellatur ingenitus, non quidem in Scripturis, sed in consuetudine disputantium et de re tanta sermonem qualem valuerint proferentium. Filius autem de Patre natus est, et Spiritus sanctus de Patre principaliter et communiter de utroque procedit. Ideoque cum Spiritum sanctum genitum non dicamus, dicere tamen non audemus ingenitum, ne in hoc vocabulo vel duos patres in illa Trinitate, vel duos, qui non sunt de alio, quispiam suspicetur ». Ecce his verbis aperte ostendit, Spiritum sanctum nec genitum nec ingenitum debere dici.

be said (to be) neither begotten nor unbegotten. Whence (St.) Augustine says to (St. Paulus) Orosius: « That the Holy Spirit (is) neither begotten nor unbegotten the certain Faith declares; because if we said (that He is) unbegotten, we will seem to affirm (that there are) two fathers; but if begotten, we are at fault for [culpamur] believing (that there are) two sons ». For just as a son alone is said (to be) begotten, so also a Father alone is said (to be) unbegotten, for the reason that He is not from [a] another. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book <u>On the Trinity</u> (says):[2] « The Father », he says, « alone is not from [de] another, for that reason He alone is named “the Unbegotten”, not indeed in the Scriptures, but in the custom of those disputing and of those proffering speech [sermonem] on the matter as much as they are able. But the Son has been born from the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds principally from the Father and commonly from Each. And for that reason since we do not say that the Holy Spirit (has been) begotten, yet we do not dare say (that He is) unbegotten, lest in this word anyone at all [quispiam] suspect (that there are) two fathers in that Trinity, and/or (that there are) two, who are not from another ». Behold with these words he has openly shown, that the Holy Spirit ought not be said (to be) begotten nor unbegotten.

Hieronymous tamen in Regulis definitionum[3] contra haereticos Spiritum sanctum dicit ingenitum esse, his verbis: « Spiritus sanctus Pater non est, sed ingenitus atque infectus. Pater non est, quia Patris est et in Patre est; processionem habet ex Patre, et non nativitatem; Filius autem non est, quia genitus non est ». Ecce his verbis dicitur Spiritus sanctus esse ingenitus, quod videtur adversari praemissis verbis Augustini.

(St.) Jerome, however, among “the Rules of Definitions”[3] against heretics says that the Holy Spirit is unbegotten, with these words: « The Holy Spirit is not the Father, but unbegotten and untainted. He is not the Father, because He is of the Father and is in the Father; He has (His) procession out of the Father, and not a nativity; but He is not the Son, because He has not been begotten ». Behold with these words the Holy Spirit is said to be unbegotten, which seems to be adverse [adversari] to the words of (St.) Augustine.

Sed ut istam quae videtur repugnantiam de medio abigamus, dicimus, quod Hieronymus aliter accepit[4] nomen *ingeniti*, et aliter Augustinus. Accepit enim Augustinus *ingenitum*, qui vel quod ab[5] alio non est; et secundum hoc de solo Patre dicitur; Hieronymus vero *ingenitum* dicit *non genitum*; et secundum hoc de Spiritu sancto

But so that we may be rid of what seems to be the inconsistency between them [repugnantium de medio abigamus], we say, that (St.) Jerome accepts[4] the name *unbegotten* in one manner, and (St.) Augustine in the other. For (St.) Augustine accepts *unbegotten*, as ‘one who’ and/or ‘as something which’ ‘is not from [ab][5]

potest dici, cum Spiritus sanctus non sit genitus.

another'; and according to this it is said of the Father alone; (St.) Jerome on the other hand means *unbegotten* as *not begotten*; and according to this it can be said of the Holy Spirit, since the Holy Spirit has not been begotten.

Quod autem Hieronymus ita acceperit, ostenditur ex verbis suis, quibus in eodem tractatu[6] utitur, faciens talem divisionem: «Omne quod est, aut ingenitum est, aut genitum, aut factum. Est ergo quod nec natum est nec factum; et est quod natum est et factum non est, et est quod nec natum est nec factum est; et est quod factum est et natum non est; et est quod factum est et natum est et renatum est; et est quod factum est et natum est et renatum non est. Nunc praepositorum singulis rebus subsistentiam destinemus. Quod ergo nec natum nec factum est, Pater est; non enim ab aliquo[7] est. Quod autem natum est et factum non est, Filius est, qui a Patre genitus est, non factus. Quod iterum nec natum nec factum est, Spiritus sanctus est, qui a Patre procedit. Quod etiam factum est et natum non est, caelum et terra[8] ceteraque, quae sunt insensibilia. Quod vero factum est et natum est et renatum non est, animalia sunt ». Ecce his verbis ostendit Hieronymus, se *ingenitum* accipere *non genitum*. Aliter enim non esset praemissa divisio vera, scilicet omne quod est aut ingenitum est, aut genitum, aut factum. Atque in divinisionis huius prosecutione in assignatione *ingeniti*, ubique ponit *non natum*.

Moreover, that (St.) Jerome accepts it thus, is shown from his own words, which he uses in the same tract,[6] making such a division: « Everything which is, either is unbegotten, or begotten, or made. Therefore, there is that which is neither born nor made; and there is that which is born and has not been made, and there is that which has neither been born nor has been made; and there is that which has been made and has not been born; and there is that which has been made and has been born and has been reborn; and there is that which has been made and has been born and has not been reborn. Now we shall appoint [destinemus] subsistence to each thing of the aforementioned (categories). Therefore, that which has neither been born nor made, is the Father; for He is not from anyone.[7] But that which has been born and has not been made, is the Son, who has been begotten by the Father, and not made. Again, that which has neither been born nor made, is the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father. Moreover, that which has been made and has not been born, (is)[8] the sky and the earth and all the other (things), which are insensible. On the other hand, that which has been made and has been born and has not been reborn, are the animals ». Behold with these words (St.) Jerome shows, that he accepts *unbegotten* as *not begotten*. For in other manner the aforementioned division would not be true, that is, that everything which is, is either unbegotten, or begotten, or made. And in the prosecution of this division, put *not born* everywhere *unbegotten* is assigned [in assignatione ingeniti].

---

[1] In dialogo nempe quaestionum sub titulo ad Orosium, quaest. 2. Sed suppositionum est hoc opus. In fine huius loci ed. 8 cum originali *culpabimus* pro *culpamur*.
[2] Cap. 26. n. 47. — In hoc textu post *sermonem* cod. D *qualemcumque* loco *qualem*. Ipse Augustinus post *principaliter* intersit: *ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante* etc. — In fine ed. 1 *non sint* pro *non sunt*, et edd. 5, 9 *de aliquo* pro *de alio*.

[1] In the dialogue, namely, of questions under the title "To Orosius", question 2. But this work is of forgers [Trans. note: *supposititium* in the original note, read as and changed to *suppositionum*, lat. for "of forgers".] At the end of this passage, edition 8 together with the original has *we will blame* [culpabimus] for *we are at fault* [culpamur].
[2] Chapter 26, n. 47. — In this text after *speech* [sermonem] codex D has *as everso* [qualemcumque]

[3] Edd. 1, 8 titulo huius operis addunt: *vel distinctionum*. Hic liber non est S. Hieronymi, nec in appendicibus editionum eiusdem invenitur. In appendice ad opera S. Ambrosii (Patrolog. Migne, Lat. tom. 17. col. 510.) impressum est opusulum anonymum sub tituolo: de Trinitate; alias, in Symbolum Apostolorum Tractatus, ex quo (c. 3. coll. 512.) textus secundum, paulo infra citatus, integre desumtus est, paucis tantum verbis deficientibus vel mutatis. Locus vero hic citatus tantum quoad *sensum* ibi exhibetur. Cum autem hoc opusculum, ut putant editores, sit mutilum et iam antiquitus interpolatum, fortasse Lombardus etiam primum textum ad verbum inde accepit. In praevia admonitione Benedictini editores huius libelli censent, ipsum contra Priscillianistas et ad vindicandum Toletanam fidei regulam esse editum atque Concilio, si minus toletano, saltem Braccarensi secundo, quod a. 563 vulgo ponitur, supparem esse. — Locum infra a Magistro exhibitum Alcuinus (de Fide Ss. Trinitatis libr. II. c. 9. Patrolog. Lat. Migne, tom. 101. col. 28.) totum reportat, sed nonnullis additis vel mutatis.

[4] Codd. A C D E *acceperit*.

[5] Vat. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9 *de*. Immediate ante ed. 1 omittit *vel quod*. Deinde codd. A B C D post *Spiritu* omittunt *sancto*. Denique ed. 1 omittit ultima verba: *cum Spiritus* etc.

[6] Cap. 3. — Vide notam paulo supra. — Immediate ante Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 8 *verbis eius* pro *verbis suis*; quod licet sit minus rectum, exhibet tamen omnes codd. et ceterae edd. Deinde ubi prima vice ponitur *nec natum* codd. omittunt *est* contra edd.

[7] Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 9 verbo *aliquo* praemittunt *alio*.

[8] Supple cum ed. 6 *est*. — Immediate post edd. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 omittunt *sunt*. Non multum infra ante *ostendit Hieronymus* cod. C addit *aperte*.

in place of *as* [qualem]. (St.) Augustine himself after *principally from the Father* [de Patre principaliter] inserts *without any interval of time itself being given* [ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante] etc. — At the end edition 2 has *are not* [non sint] in the subjunctive, and editions 5 and 9 have *from anyone* [de aliquo] for *from another* [de alio].

[3] Editions 1 and 8, add to the title of this work: *and/or distinctions* [vel distinctionum]. This book does not belong to St. Jerome, nor is it found among the appendices of the editions of his writings. In the appendix to the Opera S. Ambrosii, (Patrologia., Migne, Lat. tom. 17, col. 510) is printed an anonymous work under the title: de Trinitate; alias in Symbolum Apostolorum Tractatus, from which (ch. 3, col. 512) the following text, cited a little below this, has been excerpted in its entirety, with only a few words lacking and/or changed. But the passage cited here is only exhibited according to its *sense*. Moreover, since this work, as the editors think, has been mutilated and interpolated already from ancient times, perhaps (Peter) Lombard accepted even the first text word-for-word from this one. In the previous admonition the Benedictine editors judge of this book, that it is almost equal to the one published against the Priscillianists and to vindicate the rule of faith of the Council of Toledo, by the Council itself, or if not that of Toledo, at least that of the Second Council of Braga, which is commonly said to have taken place in A.D. 563. — The passage exhibited by Master (Peter) below, Alcuin (de Fide Ss. Trinitatis, Bk. II, ch. 9: Patrologia Latina, Migne, tom. 101, col. 28) reports in its entirety, but with not a few things added and/or changed.

[4] Codices A C D E have *accepted* [acceperit].

[5] The Vatican edition and editions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 9, have *from* [de]. Immediately before this, edition 1 omits *and/or as something which* [vel quod]. Then codices A B C D at *of the Holy Spirit* [de Spiritu sancto] omit *Holy* [sancto]. Then edition 1 omits the last words *since the Holy Spirit etc.* [cum Spirtus etc.].

[6] Chapter 3. — See note 3 above. — Immediately before this the Vatican edition and editions 4, 6 and 8, have *from his words* [verbis eius] for *from his own words* [verbis suis], which though they are less correct, yet all the codices and all the other editions do exhibit. Then where for the first time there is put *neither born* [nec natum] the codices omit *is* [est] contrary to the editions.

[7] The Vatican edition and editions 4, 5, 6, and 9, have *from any other* [ab alio aliquo].

[8] Supply with edition 6 *is* [est]. Immediately after this editions 2, 3, 5, 7, and 9 omit *are* [sunt]. Not much below this at *(St.) Jerome shows* [ostendit Hieronymus] codex C adds *openly* [aperte].

English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIII.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIII

De aeterna processione Spiritus sancti, quatenus distinguitur a generatione.

ARTICULUS UNICUS

Quaestio I.

On the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, to the extent that it is distinguished from generation.

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 1

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 230-232.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 230-232.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Post haec considerandum etc.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Supra egit Magister de processione per comparationem ad illum, ad quem et a quo est. Hic tertio loco agit de ipsa secundum[1] comparationem ad generationem, a qua differt. Et haec pars habet duas partes. In prima Magister quaerit et determinat, utrum Spiritus sanctus debeat dici *genitus*; in secunda, utrum deeat dici *ingenitus*, ibi: *Nunc considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus non sit genitus*.

Item, *prima* pars habet quatuor. In *prima* ostendi, quod Spiritus sanctus non debeat dici natus.[2] In *secunda* ostendit, quod quamvis dicatur de Spiritu sancto procedere, dicitur tamen de Filio, ibi: *Cum autem Spiritus sanctus non dicatur genitus*;

After these there must be considered etc.

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Above Master (Peter) dealt with the procession through a comparison to that, to which and from which it is. Here in the third place he deals with it according to[1] a comparison to the generation, from which it differs. And this part has two parts. In the first Master (Peter) ask and determines, whether the Holy Spirit ought to be said (to be) *begotten*, in the second, whether He ought to be said (to be) *unbegotten*, there (where he says): *Now there must be considered, since the Holy Spirit has not been begotten*.

Likewise, the *first* part has four (parts). In the *first* he shows, that the Holy Spirit ought not be said (to have been) born.[2] In the *second* he shows, that although there is said of the Holy Spirit that He proceeds, nevertheless (this is also) said of the Son,

et ratio est, quod aliter dicitur Filius procedere quam Spiritus sanctus. In *tertia* vero tentat assignare differentiam inter generationem et processionem, ibi: *Inter generationem vero Filii et processionem* etc. In *quarta* vero et ultima ostendit humanam insufficientiam[3] ad illam differentiam indagandam, ibi: *Quid autem inter nasci et procedere intersit*.

there (where he says): *Moreover, since the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) begotten*; and the reason is, that the Son is said to proceed in another manner than the Holy Spirit. In the *third*, however, he tries to assign a difference between the generation and the procession, there (where he says): *On the other hand, . . . between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit* etc.. In the *fourth* however and last, he shows the insufficiency of man[3] to track down that difference, there (where he says): *Moreover, what intervenes between "being born" and "proceeding"*.

Nunc considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus. Haec est[4] *secunda* pars, in qua Magiser quaerit et determinat, utrum Spiritus sanctus debeat dici *ingenitus*; et haec pars habet quatuor partes. In *prima* ostendit Magister et probat auctoritate Augustinis, quod Spiritus sanctus non debet dici ingenitus. In *secunda* vero ostendit contrarium auctoritate Hieronymi, quod debet dici ingenitus, et ponitur ibi: *Hieronymus tamen in Regulis distinctionum* etc. In *tertia* vero praedictam controversiam determinat per distinctionem, ibi: *Sed ut istam quae videtur esse repugnantiam*. In *quarta* auctoritatem Hieronymi confirmat suam solutionem, ibi: *Quod autem Hieronymus ita accepit* etc.

Now there must be considered, since the Holy Spirit. This is[4] the *second* part, in which Master (Peter) asks and determines, whether the Holy Spirit ought to be said (to be) *unbegotten*, and this part has four parts. In the *first*, Master (Peter) shows and proves with the authority of (St.) Augustine, that the Holy Spirit ought not be said (to be) unbegotten. On the other hand, in the *second* he shows the contrary with the authority of (St.) Jerome, that He ought to be said (to be) unbegotten, and (the argument) is placed there (,where he says): *However, (St.) Jerome among the "Rules for definitions"* etc.. But in the *third* he determines the aforesaid controversy through a distinction, there (where he says): *But so that we may be rid of what seems to be the inconsistency*. In the *fourth* he confirms with the authority of (St.) Jerome his own solution, there (where he says): *Moreover, that (St.) Jerome accepts it thus* etc..

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad intelligentiam eorum quae dicuntur in littera, quatuor quaeruntur.

Primo quaeritur, utrum in divinis sit ponere processionem.
Secundo, utrum processio Spiritus sancti sit generatio.
Tertio, utrum processio Spiritus sancti realiter differat a genaeratione.
Quarto, utrum Spiritus sanctus debeat dici *ingenitus* an,[5] non.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For and understanding of those (things) which are said in the text (of Master Peter), four (things) are asked.

First, there is asked, whether among the divine it is that one posits a procession.
Second, whether the procession of the Holy Spirit is a generation.
Third, whether the procession of the Holy Spirit really differs from generation.
Fourth, whether the Holy Spirit ought to be said (to be) unbegotten or whether,[5] not.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De processione Spritus sancti et de differentia processionis a generatione.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum in divinis ponenda sit processio.

Circa primum, quod processio sit ponenda in divinis, ostenditur:

1. Primo auctoritate Domini, Ioannis decimo quinto,[6] ubi dicit ipse Salvator: *Mittam vobis Spiritum veritatis, qui a Patre procedit*. Si ergo Veritas non dicit nisi verum, et Verbum Dei non loquitur . . .

ARTICLE SOLE

On the procession of the Holy Spirit and on the difference of procession from generation.

QUESTION 1

Whether among the divine there is to be posited a procession.

About the first, that procession is to be posited among the divine, is shown:

1. First by the authority of the Lord, in the fifteen chapter of (the Gospel of St.) John,[6] where the Savior Himself says: *I shall send you the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father*. If, therefore, the Truth says not but what is true [nisi verum], and the Word of God does not speak . . .

---

[1] Cod. M et ed. 1 *per*.
[2] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 addit *vel genitus vel Filius*, sicut et mox prosequitur: *In secunda ostendit, quod cum Spiritus sanctus non dicatur genitus, cur Filius, qui dicitur genitus, etiam dicatur procedere; ibi*.
[3] Codd. L O *intelligentiam insufficientem esse* loco *insufficientiam*.
[4] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1, omissis verbis Magisteri *Nunc considerandum* etc., loco *Haec est* ponit *Similiter*, et consequenter propter variatam constructionem paulo infra omittit *et haec pars*.
[5] Fide plurimus mss. ut A F G H I T etc. ed. 1 loco *aut* substituimus *an*.
[6] Vers. 26, ubi Vulgata: Cum autem venerit Paraclitus, quem ego mittam vobis a Patre, spiritum veritatis, qui a Patre procedit. — Vat., obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1, *Ioannis, per quam dicit Salvator*.

[1] Codex M and edition 1 read *through* [per].
[2] The Vatican edition without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1 adds *and/or begotten and/or the Son*, just as it also next procceds: *In the second he shows, that since the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) begotten, why the Son, who is said (to be) begotten, is also said to proceed; there (where he says):*.
[3] Codices L and O have *that the intelligence of man is insufficient* [humanam intelligentiam insufficientem esse].
[4] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, having omitts the words of Master (Peter) *Now there must be considered* [Nunc considerandum] etc., in place of *This is* [Haec est] puts *Similarly* [Similiter], and consequently on account of the variet construction a little below this omits *and this part* [et haec pars].
[5] Trusting in very many manuscripts, such as A F G H I T etc. and editino 1, in place of *or* [aut] we have substituted *or whether* [an].
[6] Verse 26, where the Vulgate reads: But when the Paraclete comes, whom I shall send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, who proceeds from the Father. — The Vatican edition, striving against the manuscripts and edition 1, has *of (St.) John, through which the Savior says* [Ioannis, per quam dicit Salvator].

---

p. 231

improprium, vere ergo et proprie[1] est processio in divinis.

2. Item, in divinis verissime est origo, ergo et productio; sed omni productioni activae respondet productio passiva; sed productio passiva est processio: ergo a primo[2] in divinis vere et proprie est processio.

what is improper [improprium], therefore truly and properly[1] is there a procession among the divine.

2. Likewise, among the divine most truly is there an origin, therefore also a production; but to every active production there responds a passive production; but procession is a passive production:

therefore, from the first,[2] among the divine there is truly and properly a procession.

3. Item, amor noster et est amor et[3] ab alio, et exitus eius ab alio vere et proprie exprimitur in verbo *procedendi*: cum igitur amor divinus, qui est Spiritus sanctu, vere et proprie amor sit et ab alio sit, sicut nomen *amoris* et competit propriisime, ita videtur ei convenire et *processio*.

3. Likewise, our love [amor] is both love and[3] from another, and its going-forth from another truly and properly is expressed in the word *proceeding*: since, therefore, the divine Love, who is the Holy Spirit, truly and properly is love and is from another, just as the noun *love* is most properly employed [competit], so also does *procession* seems to befit Him.

4. Item, ad completam rationem processionis ista duo requiruntur, quod sit ab alio et in alium tendat; sed amor, qui est Spiritus sanctus, non procedit a Patre, in quantum amat se, nec[4] a Filio, in quantum amat se, sed in quantum unus amat alterum, quia nexus est: ergo Spiritus sanctus est amor, quo amans tendit in alium: ergo est amor et ab alio et in alium,[5] et ista duo complectuntur rationem procesionis perfectae: ergo processio est in divinis.

4. Likewise, for a complete reckoning of a "procession" there are required these two, that it be from another and (that) it tend unto another; but the Love, who is the Holy Spirit, does not proceed from the Father, inasmuch as He loves Himself, nor[4] from the Son, inasmuch as He loves Himself, but inasmuch as the One loves the Other, because it is a nexus: therefore the Holy Spirit is the Love, by which One loving tends unto the Other: therefore there is a Love both from Another and unto Another,[5] and those two comprise [compectuntur] the reckoning of a perfect "procession": therefore there is a procession among the divine.

Contra: 1. Processio de ratione sui nominis dicit elongationem et recessionem; unde *processio* quasi *procul cessio*, sicut praecessio dicit antecessionem; sed sicut in divinis non est antecessio propter summam simultatem, ita non est elongatio propter sumam unitatem: ergo sicut in divinis non ponitur nomen *praecessionis*, ita nec[6] debet poni nomen *processionis*.

On the contrary: 1. "Procession" from the reckoning of its name means an "elongation" and "recession"; whence *procession* (is) a quasi *marching far away* [procul cessio], just as "precession" means "marching beforehand" [antecessionem]; but just as among the divine there is not a "marching beforehand" on account of the most high Simultaneity, so neither[6] ought there be posited the noun *procession*.

2. Item, in creaturis processio de ratione sui generis dicit motum, et ita indigentiam et imperfectionem; sed nullum tale nomen debet transferri ad Deum: ergo nec processio.

2. Likewise, among creatures "procession" from the reckoning of its genus means "a moving", and thus an "indigence" and "imperfection"; but no such noun ought to be transferred to God: therefore neither "procession".

3. Item, creatio dicit specialem differentiam processionis et differentiam addentem nobilitatem, quia dicit egressum rei a Creatore, qui est causa nobilissima; sed creatio passiva nullo modo reperitur in divinis; nulla enim persona dicitur creari: ergo pari ratione nec processio.

3. Likewise, "creation" means a special difference of procession and a difference adding nobility, because it means the "egress" of a thing from the Creator, who is the most noble Cause; but a passive creation is in no manner found among the divine; for no Person is said to be created: therefore for an equal reason neither (is) a procession.

4. Item, processio in creaturis non dicitur

4. Likewise, "procession" among creatures

nisi dupliciter, videlicet *localis* et *causalis*: localis, quae est in motu progressivo, causalis, quae est effectus a causa. Sed localis non potest transferri ad divina, quia nulla mutatio secundum locum nec in generali nec in speciali cadit in Deo. Et *praeterea*,[7] cum talis sit ab uno in alium, oportet ponere, quod Spiritus sanctus aeternaliter non procederet a Patre et Filio; non ergo invenitur processio localis. Sed haec nobilior est quam causalis, quia ista est entis completi et a principio intrinseco: ergo per locum a maiori nec causalis invenitur in Deo; et ita nullus modus processionis reperitur.[8]

is not meant except in a two fold manner, namely the *local* and the *causal*. the local, which is in progressive movement, the causal, which is an effect from a cause. But the local cannot be transferred to divine (things), because no change according to place, neither in general, nor in special, occurs in God. And *moreover*,[7] since such is from one unto an other, one is bound to posit, that the Holy Spirit would not proceed eternally from the Father and the Son; therefore local procession is not found (in God). But this one is more noble than causal (procession), because it is of a complete being and by an intrinsic principle: therefore <u>per locum a maiori</u> neither is the causal found in God; and thus no manner of procession is found.[8]

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus auctoritate quidem prius procedit a Patre quam a Filio, non vero prius duratione, vel causalitate, vel etiam origine.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit according to Authorship indeed proceeds from the Father before (He does) from the Son, not however according to duration, and/or causality, and/or even origin.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod processio in creaturis dicit respectum ad *principium a quo*, ut radius dicitur procedere a sole, sive flos ab arbore; et quod dicat mutationem,[9] hoc accidit ei. Et similiter ratione nominis dicit respectum ad *terminum ad quem*; et quod dicat elongationem, hoc accidit ei.

I respond: It must be said, that "procession" among creatures means a looking-back to *the principle from which*, just a ray is said to proceed from the Sun, or a flower from a tree; and because it means "change" [mutationem],[9] this does accedes to it. And similarly by the reckoning of the noun it means a looking-back to *the terminus to which*; and because it means "elongation", this does accede to it.

Quoniam igitur in divinis uterque respectus reperitur; nam persona procedens respectum habet ad principium a quo, amor procedens[10] respectum habet ad amatum, amor scilicet ille, qui est nexus et caritas: ideo vere et proprie et perfecte ratio procesionis invenitur in divinis. Unde concedendae sunt rationes ad hoc adductae.[11]

Therefore, since each looking-back is found among the divine; for a Person proceeding has a looking-back to the principle from Whom, Love proceeding[10] has a looking-back to the One loved, that is, that Love, who is Nexus and Charity: for that reason truly and properly and perfectly is the reckoning of procession found among the divine. Whence are to be conceded the reasons adduced[11] for this.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod processio dicit elongationem; dicendum, quod hoc verum est in creaturis, in quibus per approximationem ad *terminum ad quem* fit elongatio a *termino a quo* propter sui finitatem et circumscriptionem et distantiam; et[12] sic non est in Deo.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected in the Contrary, that "procession" means an "elongation"; it must be said, that this is true among creatures, in which through an approach [approximationem] to *the terminus to which* there comes to be an elongation from *the terminus from which* on account of its own finiteness and

circumscription and distance; and[12] in this manner it is not in God.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod[13] dicit motum in creaturis; dicendum, quod non transfertur ratione motus, quem dicit, sed ratione duplicis respectus, qui, quamvis non possit esse in creaturis sine motu propter imperfectionem, nihilominus tamen est in Creatore.

2. To that which is objected, that[13] among creatures it means a movement; it must be said, that it is not transferred by a reckoning of the movement, which it means, but by the reckonign of a twofold looking-back, which, though it cannot be among cratures without movement, on account of (their) imperfection, yet, nevertheless, it is in the Creator.

---

[1] Corruptam lectionem Vat. *et verba Dei non loquitur nisi proprie vere: ergo proprie* emendavimus ope antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1.
[2] Vetustiores codd. cum ed. 1 omittiunt hic in Vat. et cod. cs additum *ad ultimum*.
[3] Cod. K addit iterum *est*.
[4] Aliqui codd. ut I S T cum ed. 1 *sed nec*.
[5] Ita antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1, quamvis plures falso *in aliis* pro *in alium*; Vat. autem cum cod. cc omittit verba *ergo est* usque *in alium*.
[6] Vat. cum pluribus mss. minus bene *non* pro *nec*.
[7] Ed. 1 *propterea*. Mox Vat. *oporteret* pro *oportet*.
[8] Codd. Y ee addunt *in divinis*, cod. F *in Deo*. — De eo, quod processio sive motus localis sit ceteris motibus nobilior cf. Aristot., VIII. Phys. text. 54-60 (c. 7.).
[9] Vat. cum cod. cc *dicit motum*; plures tamen antiquiores codd. ut F H I M X Y aa bb ee cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem nostram, quae confirmatur lectione falsa multorum mss. *dicat unitatem*. Circa finem responsionis Vat. cum cod. cc, ceteris codd. tamen cum ed. 1 obnitentibus, *dicit* loco *dicat*. Dein multi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *ei*.
[10] Vat. contra omnes codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3 *ut amor procedens ab amante*. Mox cod. K post *habet* addit *ad amantem et*, sed perperam, quia in hoc divisionis membro attenditur solum secundus respectus, scil. terminus ad quem.
[11] Plures codd. ut G H I K P Q etc. *inductae*.
[12] Ed. 1 *sed* loco *et*.
[13] Vat. adiungit *processio*. Mox auctoritate vetustiorummss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *quem dicit*, et circa finem solutionis *tamen*.

[1] The corrupted reading in the Vatican edition: *and the words of God He does not speak except properly truly: therefore properly* [et verba Dei non loquitur nisi proprie vere: ergo proprie] we have emended with the help of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.
[2] The older codices together with edition 1, omit here the *to the last* [ad ultimam] added in the Vatican editino and codex cc.
[3] Codex K again adds *is* [est].
[4] Some codices, such as I S and T together with edition 1, read *but neither* [sed nec].
[5] Thus the more ancient codices, together with edition 1, though very many false read *among others* [in aliis] for *unto Another* [in alium]; but the Vatican edition, together with codex cc, omits the words *therefore there is* [ergo est] up till *into Another* [in alium].
[6] The Vatican edition, together with very many manuscripts, has less well *not* [non] for *niether* [nec].
[7] Edition 1 *on this account* [propterea]. Then the Vatican edition has *one would be bound* [oporteret] for *one is bound* [oportet].
[8] Codices Y and ee add *among the divine* [in divinis]; codex F adds *in God* [in Deo]. — Concerning this, that procession or local movement is more noble than all other movements, cf. Aristotle, Physics, Bk. VIII, text 54-60 (ch. 7).
[9] The Vatican edition together with codex cc reads *it means movement* [dicit motum]; however very many, more ancient codices, such as F H I M X T aa bb and ee, together with edition 1, exhibit our reading, which is confirmed by that false reading of many mansucripts *it means unity* [dicat unitatem]. Near the end of the response the Vatican edition, together with codex cc, however striving against all the other codices together with edition 1, has *it means* [dicat] in the subjunctive. Then many codices together with edition 1 omit *to it* [ei].
[10] The Vatican edition, contrary to all the codices and to editions 1, 2, and 3, has *as the love proceeding from one loving* [ut amor procedens ab amante]. Then codex K after *has a looking-back* [respectum habet] adds *to the one loving and* [ad amantem et], but faultily, because in this member of the division only a second looking-back is attained, namely, the terminus to which.
[11] Very many codices, such as G H I K P Q etc., have *brought forward* [inductae].
[12] Edition 1 *but* [sed] in place of *and* [et].

[13] The Vatican edition inserts, as the subject, *procession* [processio].

p. 232

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur de creatione, dicendum, quod creatio de principali impositione dicit exitum de nihilo; et ideo nullo modo significatum eius potest in Deo salvari, nec proprie nec transsumtive; non sic autem est de generatione et processione.

3. To that which is objected concerning creation, it must be said, that "creation" from its imposition of a beginning [de principali impositioni] means an going-forth from nothing; and for that reason in no manner can this signification be attributed to God [significatum eius . . . in Deo salvari], neither properly nor transumptively; not so, however, is it concerning generation and procession.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod nec causalis nec localis; dicendum, quod immo *ad modum causalis*. Et causalis uno modo convenientiam habet cum locali. Nam causalis processio *uno* modo terminatur in procedente, et ita,[1] quod nihil ultra respicit, ut cum dicitur: filius procedit a patre; *alio* modo, prout effectus respicit aliquem ut terminum; et sic procedit amor ab amante in amatum, et[2] aliquo modo *convenit* cum processione locali, quia respicit terminum *ad quem*, aliquo modo *dffert*, quia non respicit, tanquam in illo recipiatur, sed tanquam *obiectum*. Et quoniam respectus et emanatio vere reperiuntur in divinis, hinc est, quo illa emanatio dicitur ad similitudinem emanationis *causalis*. Sed similitudo *localis* processionis ibi non cadit nisi longinque; et ideo Graeci decepti sunt.

4. To that which is objected, that neither the causal nor the local (found in God), it must be said, that nay *after the manner of the causal* (it is). And the causal in one manner has agreement with the local. For causal procession is terminated *in one manner* in the one proceeding, and thus (it is terminated),[1] because it looks back to nothing beyond (that), as when there is said: a son proceeds from a father; in *another* manner, insofar as an effect looks back to someone as (its) terminus; and in this manner love proceeds from the one loving unto the one loved, and[2] in another manner *it convenes* with local procession, because it looks back to the terminus *to which*, in another manner *it differs*, because it does not look back, as if it were being received in it, but as (its) *object*. And since a looking-back and an emanation are truly found among the divine, hence it is, whereby that emanation is said after a similitude of *causal* emanation. But the similitude of *local* procession does not occur There, except in a removed sense [longinque]; and for that reason the Greeks have been deceived.

Et ad illud, quod processio localis est perfectior; dicendum, quod processio *localis* semper habet imperfectionem coniunctam de[3] ratione nominis non sic *originalis*. Et verum est, quod perfectior est inter motus; sed processio in divinis non dicit motum, sed originem sine motu et mutatione, sicut supra dictum est de generatione.[4]

And to that, that local procession is more perfect; it must be said, that *local* procession always has an imperfection conjoined from[3] the reckoning of (its) name, not so *original* (procession). And it is true, that is more perfect among movement; but "procession" among the divine does not mean "movement", but an "origin" without movement and change, just as has been said above concerning generation.[4]

SCHOLION.

I. Ratio *processionis* in creaturis continet

SCHOLIUM

I. The reckoning of "procession" among

essentialiter duplicem respectum, scil. ad terminum *a quo* et ad terminum *ad quem*. Hi respectus per se nullam important imperfectionem, unde etiam in divinis poni possunt. Secundario vero et per accidens (« hoc ei accidit, » ut dicit S. Doctor) processio in creaturis importat imperfectiones, nempe tum mutationem seu motum principii *a quo*, tum elongationem termini *ad quem*. Hae imperfectiones excludi debent a processione in divinis. Circa hanc distinctionem et aliam in solut. ad 4. postiam cfr. Alex. Hal. S. p. I. q. 43. m. 4. in corp.

creatures contains essentially a twofold looking-back, namely to the terminus *from which* and to the terminus *to which*. These looking-backs convey per se no imperfection, whenc they can also be posited among the divine. On the other hand, the secondary and per accidens procession does among creatures convey imperfections, (which the Seraphic doctor says "accede to it"), namely both change and movement of the principle *from which*, as well as the elongation of the terminus *to which*. These imperfections ought to be excluded from procession among the divine. About this distinction and the other posited in the solution to n. 4, cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 43, m. 4, in the body.

II. Conclusio pertinet ad fidem. Cfr. Aelx. Hal., loc. cit. — Scot., pro hac et duabus seqq. in Oxon. et Report. hic q. 1. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1.; S. I. q. 27. a. 1. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 11. a. 1: S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 31. m. 4. — Petr. a Tar. hic. q. 1. a. 1. — Henr. Gand., de hac et seq. S. a. 61. q. 2. n. 6. seq. — Durand., hic q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 2. — Biel, I. Sent. d. 14. q. 1.

II. The conclusion touches the Faith: Cf. Alexander of Hales, loc. cit.. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, for this and the two following questions in the Oxford Lectures and the Reportatio, here in q. 1. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1; Summa, I, q. 27, a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), Sent, Bk. I, d. 11, a. 1: Summa , p. I, tr. 7, q. 31, m. 4. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 1. — Henry of Ghent, on this and the following question, Summa, a. 61, q. 2, n. 6 ff. — Durandus, here in q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2. — (Gabriel) Biel, Sent, Bk. I, d. 14, q. 1.

[1] Supple: terminatur; Vat. cum cod. cc ad hanc suppletionem tollendam omittit *et*, quod praefigitur particulae *ita*, sed contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1.
[2] Aliqui codd. ut B T Y cum ed. 1 addunt *sic*.
[3] Restituimus ex mss. et ed. 1 *de*.
[4] Dist. 9. q. 1.

[1] Supply: is terminated; the Vatican edition together with codex cc, to remove this addition, omits *and* [et] before *thus* [ita], and reads in English *so that it looks back* etc., but contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1.
[2] Some codices, such as B T Y together with edition 1, add *thus* [sic].
[3] We have restored, from the manuscripts and edition 1, *from* [de].
[4] Distinction 9, q. 1.

atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

PRIMI LIBRI

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio II.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 232-234.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 232-234.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum processio Spiritus sancti sit generatio.

QUESTION 2

Whether the procession of the Holy Spirit is a generation.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum processio Spiritus sancti sit generatio. Et quod non, videtur.

Second there is asked, whether the procession of the Holy Spirit is a generation. And it seems that (it is) not.

1. Augustinus de Trinitate decimo quinto:[5] « Sicut Filio praestat essentiam sine ullo initio temporis et sine ulla mutatione generatio, ita Spiritui sancto processio »: ergo si non est idem quod praestat essentiam duabus personis etc.

1. (St.) Augustine (says) in the fifteenth book On the Trinity:[5] « Just as the generation presents [praestat] the Essence to the Son without any beginning in time [initio temporis] and without any change, so the procession (does) to the Holy Spirit »: therefore what presents the Essence to the two Persons is not the same, etc..

2. Item, hoc ipsum videtur *ratione*: quia generatio est emanation secundum modum fecunditatis natuae, sed, sicut supra probatum est,[6] Spiritus sanctus procedit per modum liberalitatis et amoris: ergo non generatur: ergo generatio non est processio.

2. Likewise, this very (thing) seems *from reason*: because generation is an emanation according to the manner of the nature's fecundity, but, just as has been proven above,[6] the Holy Spirit proceeds through a manner of liberality and love. therefore He is not generated: therefore the procession is not a generation.

3. Item, nihil unum exit a duobus similibus per viam generationis,[7] nisi alter sit ut pater, alter ut mater, alter ut principium activum, alter principium passivum; sed Spiritus sanctus procedit a duobus similibus: ergo si per viam generationis, alter est ei ut pater, alter ut mater; quod

3. Likewise, nothing one goes forth from two similars through the way of generation,[7] except the one be as a father, the other as a mother, the one as an active principle, the other as a passive principle; but the Holy Spirit proceeds from Two similars: therefore if through the way of generation, the One is

omnino absurdum est.

to Him as a father, the Other as a mother, which is entirely absurd.

4. Item, Filius est sua generatio et Spiritus sanctus est sua processio: ergo si procedere esset generari, Spiritus sanctus esset Filius;[8] sed Spiritus sanctus procedit a Filio et dicitur Spiritus Filii, sicut Filius dicitur Patris: ergo si Filius non est Pater, nec Spiritus sanctus est Filius: ergo nec processio est generatio.

4. Likewise, the Son is His own generation and the Holy Spirit is His own procession: therefore if "to proceed" is "to be generated", the Holy Spirit would be the Son;[8] but the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and is said (to be) the Spirit of the Son, just as the Son is said (to be) of the Father: therefore if the Son is not the Father, neither is the Holy Spirit the Son: therefore neither is the procession the generation.

Contra: 1. In his inferioribus generatio est motus ad substantiam, unde generation est substantiae productio;[9] sed processio Spiritus sancti est substantiae, sive hypostasis productio: ergo est generatio.

On the contrary: 1. Among these inferiors, generation is a movement according to substance, whence generation is the production of a substance;[9] but the procession of the Holy Spirit is of the Substance, or a production of a Hypostasis: therefore it is a generation.

2. Item, *generare* sic definitur a Damasceno:[10]

2. Likewise, *to generate* is defined by (St. John) Damascene in this manner:[10]

[5] Cap. 26. n. 47, in quo textu fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1, consentiente ed. operum Augustini, posuimus *ita* loco *sic*.
[6] Dist. 10. a. 1. q. 1. et 2.
[7] Multi codd. ut A C G H I L R S T U Y Z etc. cum ed. 1 perperam omittunt *per viam generationis*.
[8] Cod. O superflue addit: *sed Filius non est Spiritus sanctus nec e converso; ergo generatio non est procesio nec e converso*.
[9] Cfr. Aristot., V. Phys. text. 7. seqq. (c. 1.) et I. de Gener. et corrupt. text. 11. seqq. (c. 3.). — Mox Vat. cum cod. cc contra alios codd. et ed. 1 *secundum hypostasim* loco *sive hypostasis*.
[10] Libr. I de Fide orthod. c. 8: Generatio quidem in hoc consistit, ut ex gignentis substantia proles eiusdem cum gignente substantiae producatur. — Paulo infra ed. 1 post *Spiritus* addit *sanctus.*

[5] Chapter 26, n. 47, in which text, trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, with the agreement of the edition of the Opera S. Augustini, we have put *so* [ita] in place of *in this manner* [sic].
[6] Distinction 10, a. 1, q. 1 and 2.
[7] Many codices, such as A C G H I L R S T U Y Z etc., together with edition 1, faultily omits *through the way of generation* [per viam generationis].
[8] Codex O superfluously adds: *but the Son is not the Holy Spirit nor the other way around; therefore the generation is not the procession nor the other way around* [sed Filius non est Spiritus sanctus nec e converso; ergo generatio non est procesio nec e converso].
[9] Cf. Aristotle, Physics, Bk. V, text 7 ff. (ch. 1), and On Generation and Corruption, Bk. I, text 11 ff. (ch. 3). — Then the Vatican edition together with codex cc, contrary to the other codices and to edition 1, has *according to hypostasis* [secundum hypostasim] in place of *of a Hypostasis* [hyupostasis].
[10] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 8: Indeed, generation consists in this, that out of the substance of the one begetting there is produced an offspring of the same substance with the one begetting. — A little below this, on the next page, edition 1 adds *Holy* [sanctus] to *Spirit* [Spiritus].

p. 233

generare est sibi similem in substantia producere; sed spiratione vel processione producitur Spiritus similis in natura: ergo et processio est generatio.

"to generate" is to produce a similar to one's self in substance; but by the spiration and/or procession the Spirit is produced similar in nature: therefore the procession is also a generation.

3. Item, actiones et mutations denominantur a termino:[1] ergo

3. Likewise, actions and mutations are denominated by (their) terminus:[1] therefore

quaecumque conveniunt in eo quod habetur per emanationem, conveniunt in modo emanandi; sed Filius et Spiritus sanctus conveniunt in substantia, quam habent per emanationem: ergo conveniunt in emanatione: ergo si modus emanandi Filii est generatio, et Spiritus sancti similiter.

whatsoever (things) convene in that which is had through emanation, convene in the manner of emanating; but the Son and the Holy Spirit convene in the Substance, which They have through emanation: therefore They convene in emanation: therefore if the manner of the emanating of the Son is a generation, similarly (that) of the Holy Spirit (is) also.

4. Item, productio est superius ad generationem;[2] sed quaecumque producuntur, procedunt: ergo processio est superius ad generatiionem: ergo generatio est processio: ergo paris ratione processio est generatio.

4. Likewise, production is superior to generation;[2] but whatsoever (things) be produced, proceed: therefore procession is superior to generation: therefore generation is a procession: therefore for an equal reason procession is a generation.

Si dicas, quod processio appropriatur Spiritui sancto: *quaero rationem*: et videtur, quod magis debeat appropriari Filio, quia, si ratio procedendi secundum rationem intelligendi per prius est in Filio, ergo procesio magis debet ei appropriari.

If you say, that procession is appropriated to the Holy Spirit: *I ask the reason*: and it seems, that it ought more to be appropriated to the Son, because, if the reckoning of proceeding according to the reckoning of understanding, through (a consideration of what is) prior, is in the Son, therefore procession ought more to be appropriated to that.

5. Item, si generans est spirans, ergo genitus est spiratus, et e converso; sed spiratio passiva est processio: ergo etc.

5. Likewise, if the One generating is the One spirating, therefore the One begotten is the One spirated, and the other way around; but passive spiration is a procession: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sancti processio non est generatio.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit's procession is not a generation.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod sicut Spiritus sanctus non est Filius, ita nec processio Spiritus sancti est generatio.

I respond: It must be said, that just as the Holy Spirit is not the Son, so neither is the procession of the Holy Spirit a generation.

1. 2. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod generatio est productio substantiae; dicendum, quod est producere substantiam *dissimilem*, et est producere substantiam *similem* secundum *voluntatem*,[3] et est producere substantiam *similem* per modum *naturae*. Isti tres modi distinguuntur et diversi et separabiles sunt, quantum est de se. Quod patet, quia in productione Adam[4] fuit substantiae productio, et tamen non fuit generatio; Deus enim non generavit Adam, sed creavit; in productione Evae de Adam fuit similis substantiae productio, non tamen generatio, quia Adam non genuit Evam; sed in productione Abel fuit substantiae productio secundum viam naturae, et ideo fuit ibi generatio. Secundum rem igitur isti tres

1. 2. To that, therefore, which is objected in the Contrary, that generation is a production of a substance; it must be said, that there is a "producing a *dissimilar* substance", and there is a "producing a *similar* substance according to *the will*",[3] and there is a "producing a *similar* substance through the manner of *the nature*". These three manners are distinguished and are diverse and separable, as much as concerns ("producing") itself [quamtum est de se]. Wherefore it is clear, that in the production of Adam[4] there was a production of a substance, and yet it was not a generation; for God did not generate Adam, but created (him); in the production of Eve from Adam there was a production of a similar

modi distinguuntur,[5] tamen in actione creaturae non distinguutur, quia creatura non potest substantiam producere nisi similem, et hoc per virtutem naturalem. Et ratio huius est imperfectio potentiae et limitatio[6] in creatura; sed in Deo est summa potentia, et ideo in eius operatione isti tres modi habent distinctionem.

substance, not however a generation, because Adam did not beget Eve, but in the production of Abel there was a production of a substance according to the way of nature, and for that reason there was a generation there. According to the thing, therefore, these three manners are distinguished,[5] yet in the action of a creature they are not distinguished, because a creature cannot produce a substance, except one similar, and this through natural virtue. And the reason for this is the imperfection of the power and (its) limitation[6] in the creature; but in God there is a most high Power, and for that reason in His operation those three manners have a distinction.

Ideo quamvis in istis inferioribus gratia materiae sit *completa ratio* generationis:[7] productio substantiae similis, vel productio substantiae, non tamen in divinis, immo oportet addi: per modum fecunditatis naturae. Et quia ista conditio deficit[8] in productione Spritus sancti, patet, quod non sequitur.

For that reason though there is a *complete reckoning* of generation among inferiors thanks to the matter:[7] there is not, however, a production of a similar substance, and/or a production of a substance, among the divine, nay it must be added: ‘through the manner of the fecundity of nature’. And because that condition is lacking[8] in the production of the Holy Spirit, it is clear, that it does not follow.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod similem habet uterque emanationem; dicendum, quod differt emanatio in his inferioribus et in Deo; quia in his inferioribus terminatur ad *essentiam* vel substantiam, quae multiplicatur; sed in divinis terminatur *hypostases*. Quoniam igitur hypostasis, ad quam terminatur processio, est *amor*, hypostatis, ad quam terminatur generatio, est *imago* — et amoris et nexus est spirari, non generari, e converso imaginis generari, non spirari — cum non sit consimilis ratio propria hypostasum secundum se, nec erit consimilis emanatio. Ipse vero procedit, ac si ad substantiam proprie terminaretur.

3. To that which is objected, that each has a similar emanation; it must be said, that emanation differs among those inferiors and in God; because among those inferiors it is terminated at the *essence* and/or substance, which is multiplied; but among the divine it is terminated at *the Hypostases*. Since, therefore, the Hypostasis, at which the procession is terminated, is *Love*, the Hypostasis, at which generation is terminated, is *Image* — and it belongs to both love and nexus to be spirated, not generated, and conversely to an image to be generated, not spirated — since there is not an completely similar proper reckoning of the Hypostases according to Themselves, neither will there be a completely similar emanation. However, He Himself proceeds, even if (His production) is properly terminated at the Substance.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod processio est commune generationi; dicendum, quod[9] est commune generationi et procesioni proprie dictae; et nos hic loquimur de processione, prout tantum Spiritui sancto convenit; sic autem non est communis nec hoc modo praedicatur nec[10] subiicitur; nec est

4. To that which is objected, that procession is common to generation, it must be said, that[9] it is common to generation and procession, properly said; and we here speak of procession, insofar as it convenes only with the Holy Spirit; but thus it is not common nor is it in this manner predicated

intelligenda ibi communitas rei, sed solum proportionis, sive modi loquendi.

Quod ergo *quaeritur*, quare magis Spiritui sancto appropriatur, *quidam* voluerunt dicere, quod sicut nomen *proprii*[11] commune est definitioni et propriae passioni, tamen quia *definitio* addit supra nomen *proprii*, propria passio non:[12] ideo definitio habet nomen, propria passio non; sed nomen com - / -mune . . .

nor[10] subjected; nor is there to be understood there a community of the thing, but only one of proportion, or of a manner of speaking.

Because, therefore, there is asked, "For what reason is (the common name "procession") appropriated rather to the Holy Spirit?", *certain ones* wanted to say, that just as the name of (something) *proper*[11] is common to the definition and to a proper passion,* yet because the *definition* adds (something) above the name of (something) *proper*, a proper passion (does) not:[12] for that reason it has the name, the proper passion does not; but the common name . . .

---

[1] Aristot., V. Phys. text. 4: Magis autem ab eo in quod quam ex quo movetur, denominatur mutatio.
[2] Aliis verbis: productio est genus, cuius species est generatio.
[3] Corrupta lectio Vat., in qua haec duo priora distinctionis membra ita exhibentur: *est producere substantiam secundum voluntatem et est producere substantiam similem praeter naturam*, resarcitur ope mss. et ed. 1; cod. W post *dissimilem* addit *naturae*, cod. Z autem *per modum voluntatis*; ed. 1 tandem post *similem* adiicit *et hoc dupliciter, nam est producere substantiam similem*.
[4] Cod. Z Adae.
[5] Interpunctio huius loci et lectio in Vat. et cod. cc est prorsus pertubata *et ideo fuit ibi generatio secundum rem: ergo isti tres modi distinguuntur in Deo. Tamen*; obstat insuper auctoritas antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 nec non contextus.
[6] Ed. 1 hic repetit *potentiae*.
[7] Id est, completa vel sufficiens definitio generationis.
[8] Vat. contra antiquiores codd. *definit*; ed 1 *defuit*.
[9] In cod. Y et ed. 1 additur *processio*.
[10] Cod. V addit *hoc modo*.
[11] Ita plurimi codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. legit *sicut hoc nomen proprium*.
[12] Petr. Hisp. Summula, tract. de Praedicab. de Proprio ait: Proprium est quod inest soli et semper et conversim praedicatur de re et non indicat, quid est esse (essentiam) rei, ut risibile. Unde *non indicat quid est esse rei* ponitur in definitione *proprii* ad differentiam *definitionis*; definitio enim conversim praedicatur de re et indicat, quid est esse rei. Exemplum: ut substantia animata sensibilis convertitur cum animal et indicat, quid est esse eius; quia omnis definitio datur per substantialia; omne enim superior est de essentia sui inferioris. Definitio enim sic describitur ab Aristotole: definitio est oratio quid est esse rei significans; proprium autem non indicat quid est esse rei. — Mox cod. 1 *nomen proprium* pro *nomen, propria*. Deinde Vat. post *sic* addit *etiam dicunt*, quod tamen abest a mss. et ed. 1; aliqui codd. falso *sicut* loco *sic*.

---

[1] Aristotle, Physics, Bk. V, text 4: But change is denominated more from "that into which" it is moved than "(that) out of which".
[2] In other words: "production" is the genus, a species of which is "generation".
[3] The corrupt reading of the Vatican edition, in which these two prior members of the distinction are exhibited thus: *there is a "producing a substance according to the will" and there is a "producing a substance similar besides nature"*, is repaired with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1; codex W after has *a substance dissimilar to the nature* [substanitam dissimilem naturae] for the first member, but codex Z has *a substance dissimilar through the manner of the will* [substantiam dissimilem per modum voluntatis] instead; next edition 1 after *a similar substance"* [substantiam similem] inserts *and this in a twofold manner, for there is a "producing a similar substance* [et hoc dupliciter, nam est producere substantiam similem].
[4] Codex Z has Adae for the genitive of Adam.
[5] The punctuation of this passage and its reading in the Vatican editin and in codex cc is very much disturbed: *and for that reason there was a generation there according to the thing: therefore those three manners are distinguished in God. Yet*; besides, the authority of the more ancient manuscripts and of edition 1 oppose this, not to mention the context.
[6] Edition one here repeats *of the power* [potentiae].
[7] That is, a complete and/or sufficient definition of generation.
[8] The Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices, has *defines* [defninit] for *is lacking* [deficit]; edition 1 instead has *was lacking* [defuit].
[9] In codex Y and edition 1 there is added *procession*.
[10] Codex V adds *in this manner* [hoc modo].
[11] Thus very many codices together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition reads *just as this proper name* [sicut hoc nomen proprium].
[12] Peter of Hispania, Summula, tract "On the Predicables of the Proper" says: The "proper" is that which is in one alone and always and conversely is predicated of the thing and does not indicate, what is

the (essence) of thing, such as "risible" does. Whence '(that) it *does not indicate what is the "being" of a thing'* is posited in the definition of *the proper* according to the difference of the *definition*; for a definition is conversely predicated of the thing and indicates, what is the "being" of a thing. An example: just as "animate, sensible substance" is convertible with "animal" and indicates, what is its "being"; because every definition is given through subtantials; for every superior concerns the essence of its inferior. For "definition" is described thus by Aristotle: a definition is an expression signifying what is the "being" of the thing; but a proper (name) does not indicates what is the "being" of a thing. — Then codex 1 reads *proper noun* [nomen proprium] for *the name, the proper* [nomen, propria]. Next the Vatican edition after *thus* [sic] has instead *also do they speak* [etiam dicunt], which however is absent from the manuscripts and edition 1; some codices falsely have *just as* [sicut] in place of *thus* [sic].
* [Trans. note: a *proper passion* is any logical subset of a category: e.g. "automobile" is a proper passion of "vehicle".]

---

p. 234

com- / -mune retinuit, sic in proposito. — Sed hoc est absurdum dicere, quod Spiritus non habeat[1] proprium et singularem modum emanandi, sicut Filius.

it does retain; thus (is it) in the proposed. — But this is absurd to say, that the Spirit does not have[1] a proper and singular manner of emanating, just as the Son (does).

Ideo voluerunt[2] *alii*, quod addit alium modum; sed quia ille modus in creaturis non est, quia aut raro aut nunquam procedit aliqua hypostatis aliter quam per generationem, ideo sacri doctores noluerunt nomen proprium vel novum fingere, sed magis commune appropriare. — Sed illud adhuc non videtur verum, quia, sicut emanatio Filii recte exprimitur verbo generandi, ita emanatio Spiritus verbo spirandi.[3]

For that reason *others* wanted,[2] that it adds another manner; but because that manner is not in creatures, because either rarely or never does any hypostasis proceed in a manner other than through generation, for that reason the sacred doctors did not want to devise [fingere] a proper and/or new name, but rather to appropriate the common one. — But that still does not seem true, because, just as the emanation of the Son is rightly expressed by the word "generating", so the emanation of the Spirit by the word "spirating".[3]

Et propter hoc aliter dicendum, quod[4] sicut Pater dicitur ingenitus, quia ab eo removetur omnino generatio, quia nec generatur nec est a generato; similiter e conveso processio *proprie*[5] de eo dicitur, in quo est omnino ratio procedendi; et talis est Spiritus sanctus, quia procedit et est a procedente, non sic autem Filius: ideo Spiritui sancto attribuitur.

And on account of this it must be said in one manner, that[4] just as the Father is said (to be) unbegotten, because generation is entirely removed from Him, because He is neither generated nor is from One generated; similarly the other way around procession is said *properly*[5] of Him, in whom there entirely is a reckoning of proceeding; and such is the Holy Spirit, because He proceeds and is from One proceeding, but not so the Son: for that reason it is attributed to the Holy Spirit.

Aliter potest dici, quod completa ratio

In another it can be said, that the complete

processionis consistit in comparatione ad principium *a quo* et ad terminum *ad quem*; et quia Spiritus in sua emanatione, quia nexus est, utrumque respicit, Filius alterum; ideo completissima ratio huius nominis reperitur in Spiritu sancto, quamvis aliquo modo reperiatur in Filio;[6] et ideo Spiritui sancto appropriatur.

reckoning of procession consists in the comparison of the principle *from which* and of the terminus *to which*; and because the Spirit in His own emanation, because He is the Nexus, looks back to Each, the Son to the Other one; for that reason the most complete reckoning of this name is found in the Holy Spirit, although it is found in another manner in the Son;[6] and for that reason it is appropriated to the Son.

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur ultimo, quod generans est spirans, dicendum; quod illa praedicatio non est formalis, sed solum ratione suppositi;[7] et quia una persona sive unum suppositum potest generare et spirare, ideo haec est vera: generans est spirans; sed nulla persona unica potest simul pluribus modis emanare; ideo non sequitur, quod genitus sit spiratus.

5. To that which is objected last, that the One generating is the One spirating; it must be said, that that predication is not formal, but only by reason of the supposit;[7] and because one Person or one Supposit can generate and spirate, for that reason this is true: 'the One generating is the One spirating'; but no single [unica] Person can emanate in more manners all at once [simul]; for that reason it does not follow, that the One begotten is the One spirated.

SCHOLION.

I. Quod in Deo sint duae emanationes, scil. generatio et processio, iam supra d. 9. q. 1, et d. 10. q. 1. probatum est. Hic quaeritur, utrum hae duae emanationes differant, et in sequenti quaestione, cuius naturae sit haec differentia. Et agitur de generatione et processione, quatenus sunt actus notionales, sive in sensu activo. Generatio enim et processio in sensu passivo sunt secunda et tertia Trinitatis persona. — Conclusio est de fide, cum Symbolum Athanasianum de Spiritu sancto dicat: « Non factus, nec creatus, *nec genitus*, *sed procedans* ».

II. Ut solut. ad 4. facilius intelligatur, notandum est, quod in divinis vocabulum *processio* dupliciter accipitur, vel ut nomen commune, cuius species sunt generatio et spiratio, vel ut nomen speciale secundae emanationis. Nam « frequenter invenimus, quod aliquod proprium denominatur nomine communi » (S. Thom., hic q. 1, a. 3 ad 3.). Hinc oritur quaestio hic proposita, quare potius Spiritui sancto quam Filio nomen *processionis* approprietur. Primam solutionem S. Doctor reprobat, consentiente S. Thoma. Hanc tuetur Uldaricus, teste Dionysio Carth., et asserit, quod *processio* Spiritus sancti sit simpliciter processio, et quod *generatio* huic communi rationi addat differentiam specificam. Hanc assertionem

SCHOLIUM

I. That in God there are two emanations, namely generation and procession, has already been proven above in d. 9, q. 1, and in d. 10, q. 1. Here there is asked, whether these two emanations differ, and in the following question, of which nature is this difference. And it deals with generation and procession, to the extent that they are notional acts, or in an active sense. For generation and procession, in the passive sense, are the Second and Third Person of the Trinity. — The conclusion is <u>de fide</u>, since the Athanasian Creed says of the Holy Spirit: « Not made, nor created, *nor begotten*, *but proceeding* ».

II. To understand the solution to n. 4 more easily, it must be noted, that among the divine the word *procession* is accepted in a twofold manner, either as a common name, the species of which are generation and spiration, and/or as the special name of the second emanation. For « frequently we find, that something proper is denominated by the common name » (St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 3, ad 3). Hence there arises this proposed question, "For what reason is the name *procession* appropriated to the Holy Spirit rather than to the Son?" The Seraphic Doctor reproves the first solution, with St. Thomas consenting. Uldaric defended this, according to the witness of (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, that the *procession* of the

eius defensores exemplo ipsius vocabuli *proprium* illustrant. Hoc enim nomen est commune tum definitioni, quae per genus et differentiam essentialiter speciem exprimit, tum « propriae passioni » i. e. illi *accidentali* conditioni alicuius entis, quae inseparabiliter subiecto inhaeret, ut *risibilitas* homini. Nam iuxta Aristotelem *proprium* definitur: « Id quod non indicat, quid est esse rei, soli autem inest et conversim praedicatur » (v. g. omnis homo est risibilis, et omne risibile est homo). Haec igitur species *proprii* retinuit nomen commune et iuxta Porphyrium (c. 5) est quartum praedicabile, dum « genus, species, differentia sunt tria prima praedicabilia ». Hoc confirmat B. Albert. (I. Sent. d. 11. a. 2.): « *Proprium* dicitur praedicatum convertibile; tamen cum duplex sit praedicatum convertibile, scil. essentiale, ut definitio, et accidentale convertibile, accidentale nomen *proprii* retinet, et sic in multis fit ». Similia docet S. Thom. (hic q. 1. a. 3.). De multiplici sensu *proprii* cfr. S. Bonav. II. Sent. d. 16. a. 1. q. 3. — Secunda opinio docens, quod propter defectum nominis, hanc specialem processionem exprimentis, nomen commune secundae emanationi appropriatum sit, iterum Seraphico non placet, propter hanc rationem, quod revera habeatur tale nomen, scil. *spirare* et *spiratio*. Nihilominus S. Thomas in Summa (I. q. 27. a. 4. ad 3.) dictam opinionem retinet dicendo: « Unde *processio*, quae non est generatio, remansit sine speciali nomine, sed potest nominari *spiratio*, quia est processio spiritus ». Sed in comment. (loc. cit.) praeter hanc ratione, de qua dicit, « et credo quod melior est », etiam alias duas affert rationes, hic a S. Bonaventura approbatas.

Holy Spirit is a procession simply, and that *generation* adds to this common reckoning a specific difference. Those defending this assertion of his illustrate it with the example of the word *proper* itself. For this name is common both to the definition, which through genus and difference essentially expresses the species, and « to the proper passion », i. e. to that *accidental* condition of any being, which inseparably inheres to a subject, as *risibility* (does) to man. For according to Aristotle the *proper* is defined as: « That which does not indicate, what belongs to a thing, but (which) is in it alone and is predicated (of it) conversely » (v. g. ‘every man is risible, and every risible is a man’). Therefore, this species of (what is) *proper* retains the common name and according to Porphyry (ch. 5) is the fourth predicable, while « genus, species, (and) difference are the first three predicables ». This Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) confirms (Sent., Bk. I, d. 11, a. 2): « The *proper* is said (to be) the convertible predicate; however since the convertible predicate is twofold, namely the essential, as (is) the definition, and the accidental convertible, the accidental retains the name of (what is) *proper*, and in this manner it occurs in many ». St. Thomas teaches similarly (here in q. 1, a. 3). On the manifold sense of *proper*, cf. St. Bonaventure, Sent., Bk. II, d. 16, a. 1, q. 3. — The second opinion teaching, that on account of the defect of a name expressing this special procession, the common name has been appropriated to the second emanation, again does not please the Seraphic (Doctor), on account of this reason, that in truth such a name is had, namely *to spirate* and *spiration*. Nevertheless St. Thomas in his Summa (I, q. 27, a. 4, ad 3) retains the aforesaid opinion, saying: « Whence *procession*, which is not generation, has remained without a special name, but can be named *spiration*, because it is a procession of a spirit ». But in his Commentaria (loc. cit.) besides this reason, of which he says, « and I believe it is the better one », he also brings forward the two others, here approved by St. Bonaventure.

III. De conclusione: cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. a. 42. m. 2. § 1, et q. 43. m. 2. — S. Thom., loc. cit. — B. Albert., hic a. 1. — Petr. a

III. On the conclusion: cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, a. 42, m. 2, § 1, and q. 43, m. 2. — St. Thomas, loc. cit.. — Bl.

Tar., hic q. 2. a. 2, et q. 1. a. 2. — Richard. a. Med., hic q. 2. et 3. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1. — Durand., de hac seq. q. hic. q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et seq. hic q. 1. — Biel, de hac et seq. hic q. unic.

(now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 2, and q. 1, a. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here in q. 2 and 3. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 1. — Durandus, on this and the following question, here in q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, on this and the following question, here in q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following question, here in q. sole.

---

[1] Vat. praeter fidem plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 *habet*.
[2] Vat. contra codd. et ed. 1 *volunt* loco *voluerunt*, deinde *nolunt* pro *noluerunt*.
[3] Ed. 1 addendo *vel procedendi* elidit vim argumenti, scil. quod detur nomen proprium respectu emanationis Spiritus sancti.
[4] Ex plurimis codd. et ed. 1 substituimus *quod* loco *quia* et paulo infra *omnino* pro *omnis*.
[5] In multis mss. deest *proprie*.
[6] Ed. 1 brevius: *ratio huius nominis non reperitur in Filio*.
[7] In cod. X addicitur: *sicut diceres, grammaticus est musicus*.

[1] The Vatican edition, not trusting in very many manuscripts and edition 1, reads *have* [habet] in the indicative.
[2] The Vatican edition, contrary to the codices and edition 1, has *want* [volunt] in place of *wanted* [voluerunt], then *do not want* [nolunt] for *did not want* [noluerunt].
[3] Edition 1 by adding *and/or "proceeding"* [vel procedendi], elides the force of the argument, that is, that a proper name is given in respect of the emanation of the Holy Spirit.
[4] From very many codices and edition 1 we have substituted *that* [quod] in place of *that* [quia] and a little below this *generation . . . entirely* [omnino generatio] or *every generation* [omnis generatio].
[5] In many manuscripts there is lacking *properly* [proprie].
[6] Edition 1 more briefly reads: the reckoning of this name is not found in the Son [ratio huius nominis non reperitur in Filio].
[7] In codex X there is inserted: *just as you would say, "the grammarian is an artist"* [diceres, grammaticus est musicus].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 235-238.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 235-238.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum procession Spiritus sancti differat a generatione Filii realiter, vel solum secundum rationem intelligendi.

QUESTION 3

Whether the procession of the Holy Spirit differs from the generation of the Son really, and/or only according to the reckoning of understanding.

Tertio quaeritur, utrum processio Spiritus sancti realiter differat a generatione Filii, an solum secundum rationem intelligendi. Et quod realiter, videtur:

Third there is asked, whether the procession of the Holy Spirit really differs from the generation of the Son, or whether only according to the reckoning of understanding. And that (it) really (does), seems (from the following):

1. Quia personae differunt secundum suas emanationes; ergo[1] cum personae realiter differant, non tantum intellectualiter, quia, omni intellectu circumscripto, adhuc remanet trinitas: ergo emanationes, quae sunt processio et generatio, differunt realiter.

1. Because the Persons differ according to Their emanations; therefore,[1] since the Persons really differ, not only intellectually, because, in every circumscribed intellect, a trinity still remains: therefore the emanations, which are procession and generation, do really differ.

2. Item, quae sunt a diversis principiis, realiter diffferunt; sed generatio est ab uno in divinis, processio Spiritus sancti a duobus, quia a Patre et Filio: ergo realiter differunt.

2. Likewise, what are from diverse principles, really do differ; but generation is from One among the divine, the procession of the Holy Spirit from Two, because from the Father and the Son: therefore they really do differ.

3. Item, secundum rem[2] et veritatem aliquorum est principium divina substantia ut *voluntas*, quorum non est principium ut *natura*, sicut patet, quia creaturae sunt a Deo agente per modum *voluntatis*, non per modum *naturae*: si ergo processio est voluntatis per modum voluntatis, generatio per modum naturae ut naturae, processio et generatio realiter differunt.

3. Likewise, according to thing[2] and truth the Divine Substance is principle of some (things) as a *will*, of which It is not the principle as a *nature*, just as is clear, that they have been created by God acting through a manner of *will*, not through a manner of *nature*: if, therefore, procession is of the Will through the manner of will, generation as of the Nature through the manner of nature, procession and generation really do differ.

4. Item, in imagine creata egressus verbi et egressus amoris distinguuntur, quia differunt *realiter*; hoc[3] perfectionis est, quia ex hoc faciunt imaginis trinitatem, sed quod differunt *essentialiter*, hoc est

4. Likewise, in the created image the egress of the word and the egress of love are distinguished, because they *really* do differ; this[3] belongs to perfection, because out of this they make the image's trinity, but

imperfectionis; sed omne quod perfectionis est, ponendum est in divinis: ergo processio et generatio *realiter* differunt, quamvis non *essentialiter*.

because they do differ *essentially*, this belongs to imperfection; but everything which belongs to perfection, is to be posited among the divine: therefore, procession and generation *really* do differ, although not *essentially*.

Contra: 1. Pater spirat et generat, aut ergo in quantum unus, aut in quantum plures vel plura. Si in quantum *plures* vel plura, Pater[4] est compositus; si in quantum *unus*; sed quia Pater et Filius spirant in quantum unum, non sunt duae spirationes, sed una: ergo similiter, si Pater spirat et generat in quantum unum, spiratio et generatio est una productio.

On the contrary: 1. The Father spirates and generates, therefore, either inasmuch as (He is) one (Person), or inasmuch as (He is) many (Persons) and/or many (beings). If inasmuch as *many* (Persons) and/or many (beings), the Father[4] is a composite; if inasmuch as *one* (Person); but because the Father and the Son spirate inasmuch as (They are) one (Being), there are not two spirations, but one: therefore similarly, if the Father spirates and generates inasmuch as (He is) one (Being), spiration and generation is one production.

2. Item, secundum omnes verum est, quod Pater ratione fecunditatis naturae[5] generat, ratione fecunditatis voluntatis spirat; sed in Deo idem est voluntas et natura: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, according to all (authors), it is true, that the Father generates by reason of the fecundity of the[5] Nature, He spirates by reason of the fecundity of the Will; but in God the same (Thing) is Will and Nature: ergo etc..

3. Item, emanationes[6] penes terminos distinguuntur; sed Pater omnino idem et totum, quod dat Filio per generationem, dat Spiritui sancto per processionem: ergo spiratio et generatio sunt omnino una emanatio.

3. Likewise, the emanations[6] are distinguished from within the termini; but the Father gives entirely the same and the whole, which He gives to the Son through generation, to the Holy Spirit through procession: therefore the spiration and the generation are entirely one emanation.

4. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur *per impossibile*. Si differunt, aut se ipsis, aut aliis: *non se ipsis*, quia emanationes nec sunt *a se* nec *ad se*: ergo si unumquodque distinguitur per illud quod est, vel a quo,[7] emanationes huiusmodi se ipsis non distinguuntur; si *aliis*: aut *essentia*, aut *notione*, aut *persona*. *Non essentia*; constat, quia illa non distinguit nec distinguitur; *non persona*, quia eius est distingui, non distinguere: ergo si differunt, hoc erit *aliis notionibus*; et similiter erit quaerere de illis aliis, et sic in infinitum: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown *per impossibile*. If they differ, (they do so) either by their very selves, or by others: *not by their very selves*, because the emanations are neither *from themselves* nor *to themselves*. therefore if any one whatsoever is distinguished through that which it is, and/or from which (it is),[7] emanations of this kind are not distinguished by their very selves; if *by others*: either *by essence*, or *by notion*, or *by Person*. *Not by the Essence*; it is established, because That does not distinguish nor is It distinguished; *not by a Person*, because it belongs to It to be distinguished, not to distinguish: therefore if they do differ, this will be *by other notions*; and similarly there will be a seeking from those others, and in this manner unto infinity: ergo etc..

5. Item, si differunt, aut differentia

5. Likewise, if they differ, (they do) either by

substantiali, aut *accidentali*: non *substantiali*, quia talis differentia non est in divinis; non *accidentali*, quia in Deo non est accidens: ergo etc.

6. Item, plus differt Filius a creatura quam a Spiritu sancto: ergo plus differt generatio a creatione quam a processione; sed generatio non distinguitur a creatione: ergo nec a processione. Probatio *mediae*: creatio est divina essentia;[8] sed persona et essentia non distinguuntur ab invicem: ergo nec generatio et creatio.

a *substantial* difference, or by an *accidental* one: not *by a substantial* one, because such a difference is not among the divine; not *by an accidental* one, because in God there is not an accident: ergo etc..

6. Likewise, the Son differs more from a creature, than from the Holy Spirit: therefore the generation differs more from a creature, than from the procession; but generation is not distinguished from creation: therefore neither from procession. Proof of *the middle*: creation is by the Divine Essence;[8] but person and essence are not distinguished from each other: therefore neither generation and creation.

CONCLUSIO.

Generatio et spiratio non tantum secundum modum dicendi differunt, sed etiam secundum differentiam tum originis, tum habitudinis, et etiam se ipsis.

CONCLUSION

Generation and spiration do not only differ according to a manner of speaking, but also according to a difference both of origin, and of habitude, and also by their very selves.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod generatio et spiratio sive processio differunt non tantum secundum rationem dicendi, sed etiam secundum differentiam[9] originis et habitutdinis, quia diversus est modus se habendi et differens modus originis; talis autem differentia unitati essentiae non repugnat.

Si autem quaeratur ratio differentiae harum emanationum, dicendum, quod *prima* ratio differendi non potest assignari a *parte terminorum*. Termini enim sunt personae, quae non important rationem differendi active, sed passive.[10] Si ergo personae . . .

I **resepond:** It must be said, that generation and spiration or procession differ not only according to a reckoning of saying, but also according to a difference[9] of origin and habitude, because diverse is the manner of their being regarded [modus se habendi] and the manner of (their) origin (is) different; but such a difference is not repugnant to the unity of the Essence.

If, moreover, there is asked the reason for the difference of these emanations, it must be said, that the *first* reason for differing cannot be assigned *on the part of the termini*. For the termini are the Persons, who do not actively convey a reckoning of differing, but passively (do).[10] If, therefore, the Persons

---

[1] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus hic *ergo* et paulo ante *Quia*.
[2] Ed. 1 *rationem* loco *rem*.
[3] Fide mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic a Vat. additum *enim*, sicuti mox post *sed* adiunctum *secundum*.
[4] Vat. nomini *Pater* praefigit *sic*, cod. cc *quia sic*, cod Y *ergo*; sed plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 quamlibet particulam omittunt.
[5] Auctoritate fere omnium mss. et ed. 1 removimus hic a Vat. additum *intellectualis*.
[6] Vat. praeter fidem vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 addit *Patris*, et paulo infra post *idem* contra mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 omittit *et*.
[7] Pauci codd. ut M Z addunt *est*.
[8] In codd. O Z satis bene addiicitur *generatio vero est divina persona*.
[9] Codd. P Q addunt *et rationem*.

[1] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied here the *therefore* [ergo] and a little before this the *Because* [Quia].
[2] Edition 1 has *reckoning* [rationem] for *thing* [rem].
[3] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged here the *for* [enim] added by the Vatican edition, just as next after *but* [sed] the inserted *according to* [secundum: which had changed the reading to *but according to which* instead of *but because*].
[4] The Vatican edition prefixes *thus* [sic] to *the Father* [Pater], codex cc *because thus* [quia sic], codex Y *therefore* [ergo]; but very many codices together with edition 1 have nothing before it.
[5] On the authority of nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1, we have removed the *intellectual* [intellectualis], here added by the Vatican edition.

[10] Sensus est : non important ipsam rationem, quae facit differentiam, sed sunt subiecta, inter quae habetur differentia. — Paulo ante cod. X post *enim* adiungit *proprie*.

[6] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the older manuscripts and in edition 1, adds *of the Father* [Patris], and a little below this after *the same* [idem], it omits *and* [et], contrary to the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6.
[7] A few codices, such as M and Z, add *it is* [est].
[8] In codices O and Z there is added, sufficiently well, *but generation is by a Divine Person* [generation vero est divina persona].
[9] Codices P and Q add *and reckoning* [et rationem] .
[10] The sense is: They do not convey the reckoning itself, which causes the difference, but are the subjects, among which the difference is had. — A little before this codex X after *for* [enim] inserts *properly* [proprie].

p. 236

differunt, quaeritur: quibus? et necesse est redire ad emanationes et relationes, quae sunt generatio et processio;[1] et ita in hac assignatione erit circulus.

do differ, there is asked: by what? and it is necessary to go back to the emanation and relations, which are generation and procession;[1] and thus in this assigning (of a difference) there will be a circle.

Similter *ex parte principiorum*. Si enim dicatur, quod differunt hae duae emanationes secundum fecunditatem duplicem naturae et voluntatis, quaeritur,[2] quo modo differat fecunditas a fecunditate. Si dicas, quod fecunditas *naturae* est in solo Patre, *voluntatis* in Patre et Filio; hoc ulteriorem habet quaestionem, unde veniat haec differentia, et oportet ad hoc venire, quod fecunditas *naturae* est in *uno*, quia imago procedens per illam nata est esse solum ab uno, fecunditas *voluntatis* in *duobus*, quia nexus sive processio per modum nexus est in duobus; et ita redit differentia in primum, et est ibi ratio circularis. Ergo patet secundum hoc, quod harum emantionum differentia prima nec est sumenda a parte termini, nec a parte principii.

Similarly *on the part of the principles*. For if it be said, that these two emanations differ according to a twofold fecundity of the Nature and the Will, there is asked,[2] in what manner does fecundity differ from fecundity. If you say, that the fecundity *of the Nature* is in the Father alone, *of the Will* in the Father and the Son; this has a further question, whence does this difference come, and one is bound to come to this, that the fecundity *of the Nature* is in *One*, because the Image proceeding through that has been born to be solely from One, the fecundity *of the Will* in *Two*, because a nexus or procession through a manner of a nexus is in two; and thus the difference goes back into the first, and in this there is a circular reckoning. Therefore, it is clear according to this, that the first difference of these emanations is neither to be taken on the part of the termini, nor on the part of the principles.

Et ideo notandum, quod est loqui[3] de huiusmodi emanationibus quantum *ad esse* et quantum *ad distingui*.

And for that reason it must be noted, that there is a speaking[3] of emanations of this kind as much as *regards "being"* and as much as *regards being distinguished*.

Si quantum *ad esse*, sic habent rationem essendi a suis perfectis principiis et fecundis. Quia enim in Deo est perfectissima *natura* et natura vera, ideo perfecta et vera fecunditas[4] in hypostasi, quae habet rationem principii. Et quia vera

And as much as *regards "being"*, thus they have a reckoning of being [essendi] from their own perfect and fecund Principles. For because in God there is a most perfect *Nature* and a true *Nature*, for that reason a perfect and true fecundity[4] in the

et perfecta et propria est fecunditas naturae, ideo veram et propriam habet emanationem; et haec est generatio. Similiter intelligendum est de spiratione quantum ad *voluntatem*. Unde *ratio*, quare huiusmodo vere sunt[5] in Deo, est vera fecunditas naturae et voluntatis.

Hypostasis, which has a reckoning of a principle. And because true and perfect and proper is the fecundity of the Nature, for that reason It has a true and proper emanation; and this is the generation. Similarly it must be understood concerning the spiration as much as regards *the Will*. Whence *the reason*, why there are[5] truly (emanations) of this kind in God, is the true fecundity of the Nature and Will.

Si autem loquamur quantum ad *differre*, dicendum, quod se ipsis differunt, sicut ostensum est,[6] quia omnis distinctio in divinis venit a modis *originis* et *relationis*. Unde sicut duae differentiae se ipsis differunt, ut rationale et irrationale, similiter[7] in divinis hae duae emanationes. Et sicut differentiae differentiarum innotescunt nobis per alias differentias, quae ab illis oriuntur, sic et in divinis. Quia enim se ipsis distinguuntur generatio et spiratio, ad eas consequitur secundum rationem intelligendi differentia duplex: *una*, quia generatio est ab uno, sed spiratio a duobus. Quia enim generatio est emanatio per modum perfectae assimilationis, ideo ad unum principium respicit; quia vero spiratio est emanatio per modum connexionis, ideo est a duobus. *Alia* differentia est in comparatione ad nos. Quia enim Spiritus sanctus spiratur ut nectens et ita in alterum tendens, ideo Spiritus sanctus procedit ut donabilis; Filius vero generatur, et generatio non respicit tertium.

But if we speak as much as *regards differing*, it must be said, that they differ by their very selves, just as has been shown,[6] because every distinction among the divine comes from the manners *of origin* and *of relation*. Whence, just as two differences differ by their very selves, as “rational” and “irrational”, similarly[7] among the divine (do) these two emanations (differ). And just as the differences of the differences become known [innotescunt] to us through the other differences, which arise from them, so also (is it) among the divine. For because generation and spiration are distinguished by their very selves, according to these there follows [consequitur] a twofold difference according to the reckoning of understanding: *one*, because the generation is from One, but the spiration from Two. For because the generation is an emanation through a manner of perfect assimilation, for that reason it looks back to one Principle, however, because the spiration is an emanation through a manner of connection, for that reason it is from Two. The *other* difference is in comparison to us.
For because the Holy Spirit is spirated as One joining and thus as One tending unto the Other, for that reason the Holy Spirit proceeds as One who can be given [ut donabilis]; but the Son is generated, and generation does not look back to a Third.

Per has differentias necessario elicitur harum emanationum *concomitantia*. Quia spiratio dat praeintelligere generationem — non enim nectuntur nisi distincti et similes, et ita illi quorum unus est ab alio per generationem — similiter generatio dat consequenter intelligere spirationem; necesse est enim, distinctos et omnino similes per deliciosum amorem coniungi.

Through these differences the concomitance of these emanations is necessarily elicited. Because the spiration causes [dat] one to understand beforehand the generation — for They are not joined except as Ones distinct and similar, and thus as those, one of whom is from the other through generation — similarly the generation causes one to understand consequently the spiration; for it is necessary that Those distinct and entirely similar be conjoined through delightful Love

[deliciosum amorem].

Concedendae igitur sunt rationes probantes, quod differunt, sicut est manifestum in rationibus; sed illae rationes non sunt sumtae a priori.

Therefore, there must be conceded the reasons proving, that they differ, jus as it has been manifested in the reasons (given); but those reasons have not been taken a priori.

Aliqui tamen voluerunt assignare alias differentias: et *quidam* per vim spirativam et generativum dicunt differre, sed haec differentia declarat ignotum per ignotius; *alii* etiam dixerunt, quod Filius procedit per modum *esse*, Spiritus sanctus per modum *bene esse*; sed haec verba non sunt sana nec talis materiae convenientia.

Some, however, wanted to assign other differences: and *certain ones* say that they differ through the spirative and generative force, but this difference clarifies [declarat] the unknown through the more unknown; *others* also said, that the Son proceeds through the manner of "being", the Holy Spirit through a manner of *well "being"*; but these words are not sane, nor fitting to such a discussion [materiae].

1. Ad illud ergo quod primo obiicitur, utrum Pater spiret in quantum unus etc.; dicendum, quod nec in quantum unus, nec in quantum plures, sed in quantum alio et alio modo se habens; quia alio modo se habet ad Filium, alio modo ad Spiritum sanctum. Iste autem alius et alius modus se habendi non repugnat unitati substantiae vel personae; sed Pater et Filius spirant in eo, quod unum uno modo se habens. Inde est, quod duplex est processio[8] Filii et Spiritus sancti a Patre, sed una est spiratio sive processio Spiritus sancti a Patre et Filio.

1. To that, therefore, which is first objected, whether the Father spirates inasmuch as (He is) one (God); it must be said, that neither inasmuch as (He is) one (God), nor inasmuch as (He is) many, but inasmuch as One holding Himself in one and another manner [alio et alio modo se habens]; because He holds Himself to the Son in one manner, to the Holy Spirit in another manner. Moreover, this one and another manner of His Holding Himself is not repugnant to the unity of the Substance and/or of (His) Person; but the Father and the Son spirate in this, that One (is) holding Himself in one manner. Hence it is, that twofold is the procession[8] of the Son and of the Holy Spirit from the Father, but one is the spiration or procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod natura et voluntas in Deo sunt idem; dicendum, quod etsi natura et voluntas in Deo considerata absolute sint idem, tamen aliquid respicit *voluntas* ut voluntas in ratione principii, quod non respicit *natura* ut natura. Et inde est, quod sicut non sequitur: creatura est a Deo per modum voluntatis, quod ideo sit etiam per modum naturae; similiter, quia natura et voluntas comparantur ad has emanationes sub ratione *principii*, ideo nihil prohibet, has emanationes differre, quamvis idem sint in *substantia* natura et voluntas.

2. To that which is objected, that Nature and Will in God are the same; it must be said, that even if Nature and Will in God are considered absolutely the same, yet the *Will* looks back to something as Will in the reckoning of (its) principle, which *Nature* does not look back to as Nature. And hence it is, that just as it does not follow: 'a creature is from God through a manner of will', because for that reason it would also be through a manner of nature; similarly, because the Nature and Will are compared to those emanations under the reckoning of a *principle*, for that reason nothing prohibits, that those emanations differ, though the Nature and the Will be the same in *substance*.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod emanationes differunt penes terminos; dicendum, quod in

3. To that which is objected, that the emanations differ from within (their)

his inferioribus est verum, ubi emanatio dicit ens in potentia et ita imperfectum; non autem est verum in Deo, quia ibi non dicunt ens in potentia nec imperfectum;[9] unde in divinis sunt *ratio* distinguendi. Tamen si velimus dicere, quod differunt penes terminum,

termini; it must be said, that among these inferiors it is true, where “emanation” means a “being in potency” and thus “an imperfect one”; but it is not true in God, because There they do not mean a “being in potency” nor “an imperfect one”;[9] whence among the divine they are the *reason* for distinguishing (the Persons). However if we want to say, that they differ from within (their) terminus,

---

[1] Ita mss. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. initium huius propositionis variis adiectis ita exhibet: *Si ergo personae differunt, quare et in quibus differant, si ostendere voluerimus necesse est* etc. Mox ed. 1 *esset* loco *erit*.
[2] Sequimur vetustiores codd. cum ed. 1. ponendo *quaeritur* pro *quaero*.
[3] In cod. Y additur *dupliciter*.
[4] Cfr. supra d. 9. q. 1; de voluntate d. 10. a. 1. q. 1.
[5] Vat., plurimus mss. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, *sint*.
[6] In hac ipsa quaestione; cfr. etiam q. praec. praesertim ad 1. et 2.
[7] Cod. V loco *similiter* habet *sic*, cod. X *sic etiam*. Mox aliqui codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 prave *tunc* loco *sicut*.
[8] In cod. bb additur *scilicet*.
[9] Vat. sibi non constans et contra plurimis codd. nec non ed. 1 *imperfectionem*, dum cod. I et hic et paulo supra legit *imperfectionem*. Mox post *divinis* Vat. addit *non*, quod codd. cum sex primis edd. omittunt, et bene, quia subiectum huius propositionis non sunt *termini*, sed *emanationes*, quae, uti supra dictum est, in Deo se ipsis differunt et sunt ratio distinguendi. Unus alterve codex ut B O cum ed. 1 modo singulari *in divinis est ratio*, sed non ita bene propter subiecti mutationem; simile dicas de lectione cod. bb *in divinis sunt rationes*.

[1] Thus the manuscripts together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition exhibits the beginning of this proposition, with various words inserted, thus: *If, therefore, the Persons do differ, for what reason and in what do they differ, if we will want to show (that) it is necessary* [Si ergo personae differunt, quare et in quibus differant, si ostendere voluerimus necesse est] etc. Then edition 1 has *would* [esset] in place of *will* [erit].
[2] We follow the older codices together with edition 1, by putting *there is asked* [quaeritur] in place of *I ask* [quaero].
[3] In codex Y there is added *in a twofold manner* [dupliciter].
[4] Cf. above d. 9, q. 1; on the will in d. 10, a. 1, q. 1.
[5] The Vatican edition, striving against very many manuscripts and edition 1, has the subjunctive *are* [sint].
[6] In this question itself; cf. also the preceding question, especially in reply to nn. 1 and 2.
[7] Codex V in place of *similarly* [similiter] has *in this manner* [sic], codex X has *in this manner also* [sic etiam]. Then some codices together with editions 1, 2, and 3, have the distorted reading *then* [tunc] in place of *just as* [sicut].
[8] In codex bb there is added *namely* [scilicet].
[9] The Vatican edition, not consistent with itself, and against very many codices, not to mention edition 1, reads *imperfection* [imperfectionem], while codex I both here and a little before this reads *imperfection* [imperfectionem]. Then to *among the divine they are* [in divinis] the Vatican edition adds *not* [not], which the codices together with the six first editions omit, and well so, because the subject of this proposition is not the *termini*, but the *emanations*, which, as has been said above, in God differ by their very selves and are the reason for distinguishing (the Persons). One or the other codex, such as B and O, together with edition 1, in a singular manner have *among the divine it is the reason* [in divinis est ratio], but not so well on account of the change of subject; one may say the same concerning the reading of codex bb *among the divine they are the reasons* [in divinis sunt rationes].

---

p. 237

non accipiemus terminum pro substantia vel

we will not accept “terminus” for the

essentia, sed pro hypostasi, ut prius habitum est.[1]

Substance and/or Essence, but for Hypostasis, as has been had before.[1]

4. Ad illud quod quaeritur, utrum se ipsis vel aliis; patet, quod *se ipsis*. Et ad id[2] quod obiicitur, quod non habent *esse a se*, ergo nec *distingui*; dicendum, quod illud non tenet in esse originali. Quamvis enim differentiae habeant ortum a genere, tamen non distinguuntur a genere, sed se ipsis.[3]

4. To that which is asked, whether (they differ) by their very selves and/or by others; it is clear, that (they do so) *by their very selves*. And to that[2] which is objected, that they do not have *"being" from themselves*, therefore neither a *being distinguished*; it must be said, that that does not hold in original "being". For though the differences have (their) rise from the genus, nevertheless they are not distinguished by the genus, but by their very selves.[3]

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quo modo differunt, aut substantiali aut accidentali differentia; dicendum, quod insufficienter dividit, quia in divinis est *relationum* differentia, ut dicit Augustinus in quinto de Trinitate,[4] quae nec *accidentalis* nec *substantialis* est, sed magis dicitur *originalis*.

5. To that which is objected, in what manner do they differ, either by a substantial or an accidental difference; it must be said, that (this) divides (it) insufficiently, because among the divine there is a difference *of relations*, as (St.) Augustine says in the fifth (book) On the Trinity,[4] which is neither *accidental* nor *substantial*, but rather is said (to be) *original*.

6. Ad illud quod obiicitur de creatione, dicendum, quod ratione connotati magis differt creatio; sed ratione principalis significati non tantum differunt, quia non tantum differt *essentia* a persona, quantum *persona* a persona. Unde praedicatur essentia[5] de persona nec facit aliquo modo aliquem numerum; persona vero distinguitur ab alia persona; et ideo non valet argumentum.

6. To that which is objected concerning creation, it must be said, that by reason of what is connoted [ratione connotati] creation differs more; but by reason of the principle (thing) signified they do not differ so much, because the *Essence* does not differ as much from a Person, as a *Person* (does) from a Person. Whence the Essence[5] is predicated of [de] the Person and does not cause any number in any manner; a Person, on the other hand, is distinguished from another Person; and for that reason the argument is not valid.

SCHOLION.

I. In solutione huius subtilis quaestionis antiqui Scholastici diversis viis incedunt. Ut status quaestionis accurate discernatur, attendendum est, quod hic agitur de generatione et spiratione activa, non de passiva. Unde haec quaestio differt tum a quaestione de differentia inter secundam et tertiam divinam personam (de qua supra d. 9. q. 2.), tum ab illa, quid sit *potentia* generandi (d. 7. q. 1.), cum qua tamen cohaeret.

SCHOLIUM

I. In the solution of this subtle question the ancient Scholastics set out in diverse ways. That the state of the question be accurately discerned, it must be attended to, that here it deals with active generation and spiration, not with the passive. Whence this question differs from both the question concerning the difference between the Second and Third Divine Person (concerning which, see above d. 9, q. 2), and from that, "What is the *power* of generating?" (d. 7, q. 1), with which, however, it is grouped [cohaeret].

Quaeritur igitur primo, cuius naturae sit distinctio inter generationem et spirationem activam. Primo cum sententia communi resolvitur, quod non sit distinctio mere *rationis* sive secundum modum dicendi; insuper in fundam. asseritur, has

Therefore, there is first asked, of what nature is the distinction between active generation and spiration. First it is resolved with the common sentence, that it is not a distinction merely *of reckoning* or according to a manner of speaking; moreover in the

emanationes *realiter diffferre*. Sensus huius distinctionis *realis* a Brulifero et Barth. de Barberiis (Cursus Theol. disp. 12. q. 7. conclus. 3.) explicatur, ut idem dicat ac distinctio *formalis* Scoti. Alii eam intelligunt in sensu distinctionis *virtualis*. Plura de hoc vide infra d. 26. q. 1, ubi in Scholio mens Seraphici, collatis variis eiusdem locis, explicabitur. Sufficiat hic notare, non intelligi sub hoc nomine distinctionem stricte realem *absolutam*, sed « secundum differentiam originis et habitudinis », i. e. « distincta est una ab alia non re essentiali, sed notionali », ut dicit Richard. (hic q. 3.). Insuper constat, S. Doctorem interdum omnem distinctionem maiorem, quam quae est rationis ratiocinantis, nominare realem.

fundament there is asserted, that these emanations *really differ*. The sense of this *real* distinction is explained by Brulifer and Bartolomeo dei Barberi (Cursus Theologicus, disp. 12, q. 7, conclusion 3), that it means the same as Scotus' *formal* distinction. Others understand it in the sense of a *virtual* distinction. For more on this see below d. 26, q. 1, where in the Scholium the mind of the Seraphic (Doctor), by means of a collation of various passages of the same, shall be explained. It is sufficient here to note, that there is not understood under this name a strictly real, *absolute* distinction, but (rather one) « according to the difference of origin and habitude », i. e. « one is distinct from the other, not by an essential reality [re], but by a notional one », as Richard (of Middletown) says (here in q. 3). Moreover, it is established, that the Seraphic Doctor sometimes calls every distinction greater that that which is of the reckoning of one reasoning, a real one.

Deinde supposita hac duarum emanationum differentia, iterum quaeritur, quae sit *ratio* huius differentiae, et cum plures assignari possint rationes, quae sit *prima* eiusdem ratio. In hac secunda quaestione stat praecipua difficultas, quae tanta est, ut Aureolus cum Nominalibus temeritatis arguat eos qui hoc indagare praesumant. Etiam Augustinus cum Magistro (hic in textu) propriam circa hoc ignorantiam confitetur. Quid alii Scholastici circa hanc difficultatem doceant, paucis dicamus.

Then with this difference of the two emanations supposed, there is again asked, what is *the reason* for this difference, and since very many reasons can be assigned, what is the *first* reason for the same. In this second question chiefly stands the difficulty, which is so great, that (Peter) Aureolus, together with the Nominalists, accuses those of temerity, who presume to explore this matter. Even (St.) Augustine, together with Master (Peter Lombard), here in the text, confesses his own ignorance about it. What the other Scholastics teach about this difference, we shall explain briefly.

II. Praecipui doctores et antiqui et moderni conveniunt in nonnullis assertionibus, in aliis dissident. *Conveniunt* (praeter Durand.)

1. in hoc, quod *radicalis* ratio diversitatis huius ponenda sit in differenti ratione utriusque productionis, cum Filius producatur per modum *intellectus* et *naturae*, Spiritus sanctus per modum *voluntatis* et *liberalitatis*. Hoc docet S. Bonav., supra d. 6. a. 1. q. 2, d. 19. a. 1. q. 1, hic et in fundam. et in corp. — Communiter theologi, praesertim post Conc. Florentinum, docent, harum emanationum principium *quod* esse personas producentes, principium vero *quo* proximum primae emanationis esse essentiam divinam

II. The chief doctors, both ancient and modern, agree in not a few assertions, and disagree in others.

1. *They agree* (excepting Durandus) in this, that the *radical* reason for this diversity is to be posited in the different reckoning of each production, since the Son is produced through a manner *of understanding* and *of nature*, the Holy Spirit through a manner *of will* and *of liberality*. St. Bonaventure teaches this above in d. 6, a. 1, q. 2, in d. 19, a. 1, q. 1, here and in the fundament and in the body (of the response). — Commonly theologians, especially after the Council of Florence, teach, that the *principium quod* of these emanations is the Persons producing, but the proximate

cum *intellectu*, sive *memoriam fecundam* (uti multi cum Seraphico loquuntur); secundae vero principium *quo* esse eandem essentiam cum *voluntate* sive *voluntatem fecundam*.

principium quo of the first emanation is the Divine Essence with the *Intellect*, or *the fecund Memory* (thus speak many theologians together with the Seraphic Doctor); but the *principium quo* of the second (emanation) is the same Essence with the *Will* or *the fecund Will*.

2. Natura divina aeque formaliter et per se communicatur Spiritui sancto ac Filio. Licet huic positioni nonnulli contradicant, videtur esse certa doctrina, quam docet S. Bonav. praesertim d. 10. a. 1. q. 1. ad 3. Unde sequitur, radicem illius differentiae quaerendam esse in proprietate duplicis huius fecunditatis (cfr. hic q. 2. ad 1. et 2.).

2. The Divine Nature is equally and through Itself communicated to the Holy Spirit and to the son. Though not a few contradict this position, it seems to be the doctrina certa, which St. Bonaventure teaches especially in d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, in reply to n. 3. Whence it follows, that the root of that difference be sought in the property of this twofold fecundity (cf. here q. 2, in reply to nn. 1 and 2).

3. Plures possunt et debent assignari differentiae harum emanatinum: nempe differentia *terminorum*, sive personarum emanatarum, quae certe realiter distinguuntur; differentia *principiorum*, tum quia generatio est ab uno, et spiratio a duobus (hic in 2. fundam. et corp.), tum quia principium *quo* proximum est aliud et aliud (3. fundam.); denique est differentia in *comparatione ad nos* (in corp.), quia in secunda emanatione est aliquis specialis respectus ad creaturam secundum *aptitudinem donabilitatis*, de quo cfr. infra d. 18. q. 2. et 5. Nec est controversia, utrum hae differentiae *subsistant*, sed quae earum sit *prima* ratio et quasi a priori.

3. Very many differences for these emanations can and ought to be assigned, namely a difference *of termini*, or of the Persons emanated, which certainly are really distinguished; a difference *of principles*, both because generation is from One, and spiration from Two (here in the 2nd fundament and the body); then there is the difference in *comparison to us* (in the body), because in the second emanation there is some special looking-back to the creature according to (His) *aptitude of donability*, concerning which cf. below d. 18, q. 2 and 5. Nor is the controversy, whether these differences *subsist*, but what is their *first* and quasi a priori reason.

III. *Dissident* vero theologi circa aliquas determinationes specialiores.

III. On the other hand, theologians disagree about some special determinations.

1. Durandus cum nonnullis nullam aliam differentiam admittere videtur nisi hanc, quod generatio procedat ab uno, spiratio a duobus, quam sententiam merito S. Doctor cum communi impugnat.

1. Durandus with not a few others seems to admit no other difference but this, that the generation proceeds from One, the spiration from Two, which sentence the Seraphic Doctor, with the common opinion, meritedly impugns.

2. Disputatur, utrum praeter differentias petitas quasi *extrinsecus* (sive *originaliter* a suis principiis, i. e. personis producentibus, sive *consequenter* a suis terminis) emanationes hae etiam intrinsecus et *formaliter* (a priori) differant *se ipsis*. i. e. propriis ipsarum rationibus, analogo modo, sicut ultimae differentiae (v. g. rationale et irrationale) differunt. Si hoc affirmatur, haec differentiae dici debet prima et quasi formalis. Illud affirmat S. Doctor in corp. et ad 4. Consentiunt praeter alios Petr. a Tar. et Ricahrd. a Med. et praecipue Scot., qui

2. There is a dispute, whether besides the differences sought *extrinsically* (of *originally* from their own principles, i. e. from the Persons producing, or *consequently* from their termini) these emanations also intrinsically and *formally* (a priori) differ by their very selves, i. e. by the proper reckonings of the (emanations) themselves, in an analogous manner, just as the last difference (v. g. the “rational” and the “irrational”) differ. If this be affirmed, this difference ought to be said (to be) the first and quasi formal. The Seraphic

etiam addit: « differunt *se totis* ». Haec ultima particula explicatur a Scotistis in hoc sensu, quod duabus emanationibus non sit communis aliqua realitas per differentias contrahibilis, licet conveniant in conceptu communi entis et relationis (Rada, Controv. 14. a. 2; Macedo. Coll. 7. diff. 2, qui acriter Scotum contra interpretationem ipsius, quam facit Caietanus, defendit). — S. Thomas in Summa (I. q. 27. a. 4. ad 1.) concordat cum S. Bonaventura docendo, quod *propriis ipsarum rationibus differant*, quod idem est ac *se ipsis differre*, uti concedit Caietanus (ad hunc locum). Sed idem, de Potentia q. 10. a. 2. hanc sententiam non admittit; de alia vero, quod penes *principia* distinguantur, sic iudicat: « Non sufficit, nisi aliud addatur »; denique tertiam ponit, quod « *solus ordo* processionum, qui attenditur secun- / -dum originem, . . .

Doctor affirms this in the body (of the response) and in reply to n. 4. Besides the others, (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Richard of Middletown and chiefly (Bl. John Duns) Scotus agree, the last of whom even adds: « they differ *by their entire selves* [se totis] ». This last word is explained by the Scotists in this sense, that common to the two emanations there is not some reality through the differences of the contractible, though they do convene in the common concept of being [entis] and relation (Rada, Controv., 14, a. 2; Macedo, Coll., 7, diff. 2, who bitterly defends Scotus against the interpretation of him, which Cajetan made). — St. Thomas in the Summa, (I, q. 27, a. 4, ad 1) agrees with St. Bonaventure in teaching, that *they differ by the proper reckonings of (the emanations) themselves*, which is the same as *to differ by their very selves*, as Cajetan concedes (on this passage). But the same (Saint) in de Potentia, q. 10, a. 2, does not admit this sentence; on the other hand concerning the other (difference), that they are distinguished from within (their) *principles*, he judges in this manner: « It does suffice, unless something be added »; then he posits a third (difference), that « *the order alone* of the processions, which is attained according / to origin,

[1] Quaest. praeced. ad 3.
[2] Plures codd. ut F H K T etc. *illud*.
[3] Vat. cum ed. 1 *sed a se ipsis*, obstant autem mss.
[4] Cap. 5. n. 6. — Mox cod. Z *differentia* loco *dicitur*.
[5] Vat. et cod. cc *essentialiter* pro *essentia*, sed emendatur ex ceteris mss. et ed. 1.

[1] The preceding question, in reply to n. 3.
[2] Very many codices, such as F H K T etc., have *that* [illud].
[3] The Vatican edition, together with edition 1, has *but from their very selves* [a se ipsis], but the manuscripts oppose this.
[4] Chapter 5, n. 6. — Then codex Z has *an original difference* [differentia originalis] in place of *is said (to be) original* [dicitur originalis].
[5] The Vatican edition and codex cc have *essentially it is* [essentialiter] for *the Essence* [essentia], but this is emended from all the other manuscripts and edition 1.

---

p. 238

secun- / -dum originem, processiones multiplicat in divinis ». In Comment. (hic q. 1. a. 2. ad ult.) idem contra rationem S. Bonaventurae de circulo vitioso dicit: « Quod ergo obiicitur, quod relationes consequuntur processiones, unde magis videtur, quod processiones diversae causent

to origin, multiplies the processions among the divine ». In his Comment., (here in q. 1, a. 2, ad. ult.), the same (Saint) speaks wrongly [vitioso] against the reason of St. Bonaventure concerning the circular (argument): « What, therefore, is objected, that the relations are consequent to the

diversitatem relationum, quam e converso, vel ad minus erit ibi circulatio; dicendum, quod relatio in divinis non tantum habet, quod sit *relatio*, sed etiam quod sit *personalis*, id est constituens personam, et ex hoc habet quasi actum differentiae constitutivae et formae propriae ipius personae, cuius est operatio generationis et spirationis; et ideo non est inconveniens, quod secundum relationis rationem relationes consequantur ipsas processiones et recipiant differentiam ab eis; secundum autem quod sunt formae propriae ipsarum personarum, causent differentiam processionum ». Quomodo varia Angelici dicta concilianda sint, disputatur, et conferri potest Caietanus (ad q. 27. a. 4; q. 36. a. 2.). Porro aliquae rationes S. Thomae impugantur a Scoto, de quo cfr. Rada et Macedo locis citatis. Ceterum eadem difficultas et quaedam differentiae opinionis inter Seraphicum et Angelicum redit infra d. 27. p. I. q. 2, ubi plura dicentur in Scholio de hac subtilissima materia.

processions, whence it rather seems, that diverse processions cause the diversity of relations, than the other way around, and/or what is less that there will be There a circulation; it must be said, that "relation" among the divine has not only, that it be a "relation", but also that it be a *personal* one, that is one constituting a Person, and from this it has a quasi act of the constitutive difference and form of the Person Himself, the operation of which (act) belongs to the generation and spiration; and for that reason it is not unbefitting, that according to the reckoning of "relation" the relations be consequent to those processions and receive a difference from them; but according to which they are proper forms of the Persons Themselves, they cause the difference of the processions ». In what manner the various sayings of the Angelic (Doctor) are to be reconciled, is disputed, and one can confer with Cajetan (at q. 27, a. 4; q. 36, a. 2). Next are the other reasons of St. Thomas, impugned by (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, concerning which, cf. Rada and Macedo, locc. citt.. Otherwise the same difficulty and certain difference of opinion between the Seraphic and Angelic (Doctors) returns below in d. 27, p. I, q. 2, where more will be said in the Scholium on this most subtle matter.

3. Diversus modus loquendi est circa *rationem propriam*, cur processio per modum *naturae* differat ab alia per modum *voluntatis*. In prima secundum Bonaventuram (hic in corp.) est « emanatio per modum perfectae assimilationis », et antea dicit, quod per illam procedat *imago*. Quae verba, si conferantur cum explicatione imaginis, quam dat d. 31. p. II. a. 1. q. 2, et cum dictis d. 10. a. 1. q. 1 ad 2. 3, clare probant, Seraphicum consentire sententiae S. Thomae, qui (S. I. q. 27. a. 4.) docet, in prima emanatione esse rationem *similitudinis* vi *ipsius processionis*, non in secunda. Hinc sequitur, falso attribui Seraphico sententiam, cui Richardus (hic q. 3.), favere videtur, quod ista ratio quaerenda sit in hoc, quod Filius accipiat solummodo *voluntatem* fecundam, non *naturam* fecundam.

3. There is a diverse manner of speaking about a *proper reckoning* [rationem propriam], why a procession through a manner *of nature* differs from the other through the manner *of will*. In the first, according to (St.) Bonaventure (here in the body of the response), is « an emanation through a manner of perfect assimilation », and before this he says, that through it proceeds the *image*. Which words, if they are brought together with the explanation of the image, which (the Saint) gives in d. 31, p. II, a. 1, q. 2, and with what is said in d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, in reply to nn. 2 and 3, clearly prove, that the Seraphic (Doctor) consented to the sentence of St. Thomas, who (Summa, I, q. 27, a. 4) teaches, that in the first emanation there is a reckoning of *similitude* by force *of the procession itself*, (but) not in the second. Hence it follows, that there is falsely attributed to the Seraphic (Doctor) the sentence, which Richard of Middletown (here in q. 3), seems

to favor, that that reckoning of his is to be sought in this, that the Son accepts only a fecund *will*, not a fecund *nature*.

4. Disputatur, utrum dici queat, Spiritum sanctum procedere necessario quidem, sed tamen *libere*, quod cum aliis dicit Scotus et etiam S. Thomas de Potent. q. 10. a. 2. ad 5, qui tamen aliis in locis docent, procedere *naturaliter*, quamvis per modum voluntatis. Certe hoc vocabulum *libere* sumitur hic non in sensu stricto et nunc communiter recepto, sed pro *voluntarie*, quatenus non excludit necessarium, ut apud plurimos antiquos Patres et doctores et etiam apud S. Bonav., II. Sent. d. 25. p. II. q. 2. Unde Rada (Contr. 13) et Macedo (Coll. 7.) recte probant, esse hic potius litem de nomine.

4. There is a dispute, whether there is able to be said, that indeed the Holy Spirit proceeds necessarily, but yet *freely* [libere], which (Bl.) Scotus says together with others, and even St. Thomas, de Potentia, q. 10, a. 2, in reply to n. 5 says, although through a manner of will. Certainly this word *freely* is taken here not in the strict and now commonly accepted sense, but for *voluntarily*, to the extent that it does not exclude the necessary, as is (taught) among very many ancient Fathers and Doctors, and even by St. Bonaventure, Sent., Bk. II, d. 25, p. II, q. 2. Whence Rada (Conrov., 13) and Macedo (Coll., 7) rightly prove, that this is rather an argument over the name.

5. Disputatur, utrum Verbum procedat per actum *dicendi*, ut vult Scotus, cui favet Bonaventura, an per actum *intelligendi*, ut docet S. Thomas cum suis. De hac controversia cfr. infra d. 27. p. II. q. 1. et 3. et Scholion.

5. There is a disputed, whether the Word proceeds through an act *of speaking*, as (Bl.) Scotus wants, which (St.) Bonaventure favors, or whether through an act *of understanding*, as St. Thomas with his own (disciples) teaches. On this controversy cf. below d. 27, p. II, q. 1 and 3 and its Scholium.

IV. Sensus solutionis ad 4. hic est. Licet hi actus notionales non habeant esse a se et extrinsecus distinctionem a suis principiis originalibus, tamen intrinsice distinguutur se ipsis. Neganda enim est ista illatio (« non tenet illud »), quod in esse ab alio orto non possit intrinsecus esse distinctio. Sic albedo et nigredo, licet sint ab aliis causis, differunt *se ipsis*. Ipse S. Doctor exemplum ponit ultimarum differentiarum, quae se ipsis distinguuntur, « quamvis a genere ortum habet ». Genus enim, quod iuxta Aristotelicos in se *potentia* continet species et differentias, aliquo modo est principium differentiarum. In obiectione igitur commissa est fallacia figurae dictionis, quia mutatum est genus unius causae, scil. *efficientis*, in aliud genus scil. *formalis*.

IV. The sense of the solution to n. 4 is this. Though these notional acts do not have "being" from themselves nor an extrinsic distinction from their own original principles, yet intrinsically they are distinguished by their very selves. For that illation, « that that does hold », is to be denied, because in that which has arisen from another, there cannot be intrinsically a distinction. Thus "whiteness" and "blackness", though they are from other causes, differ *by their very selves*. The Seraphic Doctor himself gives an example of the last differences, which are distinguished by their very selves, « though they have their rise from the genus ». For a genus, which according to the Aristotelians contains in itself *in potency* the species and their differences, is in another manner the principle of the differences. Therefore in the objection there is committed the fallacy of the figure of speech, because the genus of one cause, namely, *the efficient*, has been changed into another genus, namely, *the formal*.

V. Praeter iam laudatos auctores cfr. Scot., in utroque scripto hic q. unica. — B. Albert., hic a. 1, et d. 11. a. 5. — Petr. a

V. Besides the authors already praised, cf. (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, in each verys of his Commentarium, here in the q. sole. — Bl.

Tar., hic q. 2. a. 1. — Richard. a. Med., hic q. 3. — Aegid. R. hic 1. princ. q. 2. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 60. q. 1. n. 36. et seq.

(now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1, and in d. 11, a. 5. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here in q. 3. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, Summa, a. 60, q. 1, n. 36 ff..

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio IV.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 238-239.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 4

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 238-239.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO IV.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus sit ingenitus.

SUPPOSITA DIFFERENTIA generationis et processionis, quaeritur hic quarto, utrum Spiritus sanctus sit ingenitus. Et quod sic, videtur:

1. *Auctoritate* Hieronymi, quam Magister ponit in littera.[1]

2. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur *ratione* Hieronymi:[2] « Quia omne quod est, aut est ingenitum, aut genitum, aut factum »; sed Spiritus sanctus non est genitus, aut factus:

QUESTION 4

Whether the Holy Spirit is unbegotten.

WITH THE DIFFERENCE of generation and procession supposed, there is here asked fourth, whether the Holy Spirit is unbegotten. And it seems that (He is) so:

1. *From the authority* of (St.) Jerome, which Master (Peter) puts in the text.[1]

2. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown by *reckoning* of (St.) Jerome:[2] « Because everything which is, either is unbegotten, or begotten, or made »; but the Holy Spirit is

ergo est ingenitus.

not begotten, nor made: therefore He is unbegotten.

3. Item, negatio privativa cum constantia subiecti aequipollet termino privativo. Unde *non par* circa numerum idem est quod *impar*;[3] et sic, cum Spiritus sanctus genitus non sit, ergo est ingenitus.

3. Likewise, a privative negation with a constancy of subject is equipollent to a privative term [termino]. Whence *not equal* [non par] in number is the same as what *unequal* [impar] (is);[3] and in this manner, since the Holy Spirit is not begotten, therefore He is unbegotten.

4. Item, plus distat a ratione generationis Spiritus sanctus, quam Pater; quia Pater generat, quamvis non generetur, Spiritus vero sanctus nec generat nec generatur: ergo aeque vere privatur generatio a Spiritu sancto ut a Patre: ergo, sicut Pater dicitur ingenitus, sic et Spiritus sanctus.

4. Likewise, the Holy Spirit is more distant from the reckoning of generation, than the Father (is), because the Father generates, though He is not generated, but the Holy Spirit neither generates nor is generated: therefore equally, truly is "being generated" [generatio] lacking from [privatur a] the Holy Spirit as from the Father: therefore just as the Father is said (to be) unbegotten, so also the Holy Spirit.

Contra: 1. Augustinus ad Orosium[4] dicit, quod « solus Pater est ingenitus »: ergo secundum hoc non convenit Spiritui sancto.

On the contrary: 1. (St.) Augustine says (in his letter) to (St. Paulus) Orosius,[4] that « the Father alone is unbegotten »: therefore according to this (this term) does not befit the Holy Spirit.

2. Item, *ingenitus* aut dicitur secundum *substantiam*, aut secundum *relationem*. Si secundum *relationem*, ergo est notio: ergo Spiritus sanctus habet duas notiones, et ita essent sex; quod est contra communem opinionem. Si secundum *substantiam*: ergo pari ratione diceretur de Filio, cum illud quod secundum substantiam dicitur, conveniat tribus.

2. Likewise, *unbegotten* is either said according to *substance*, or according to *relation*. If according to *relation*, therefore it is a notion: therefore the Holy Spirit has two notions, and thus there would be six (notions in the Trinity), which is contrary to the common opinion. If according to *substance*: therefore for an equal reason it would be said of the Son, when one means 'that which (is) according to substance', that it befits the Three.

3. Item, cum divina essentia non sit genita, nec Spiritus sanctus sit genitus, nec Pater sit genitus, nec etiam aliquod istorum sit factum: ergo ratio *ingeniti* secundum Hieronymum omnibus convenit; quaeritur ergo, quo modo *differenter*.[5]

3. Likewise, since the Divine Essence is not begotten, and the Holy Spirit is not begotten, and the Father is not begotten, and any of These is not made: therefore the reckoning of *unbegotten* according to (St.) Jerome befits all; therefore it is asked, in what manner (does it befit each) *differently*.[5]

---

[1] Hic, c. 4.
[2] Vide lit. Magistri, c. 4. — Mox aliqui codd. ut A W X Y *Quod* loco *Quia*.
[3] Cfr. Aristot., II. Periher. c. 1. (c. 19.) et Comment. Boethii in hunc locum, ubi ait: Idem enim valet ad intelligendum quod dicitur iniustus, tanquam si dicatur non iustus. — Paulo infra ope mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *sanctus*.
[4] Quaest. 2. et. 8. Vide lit. Magistri, c. 4.
[5] Sequimur multos codd. loco *differunt* ponendo *differenter*, supple: singulis conveniat.

---

[1] Here in ch. 4.
[2] See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 4. — Then smoe codices, such as A W X Y, have *Because* [Quod] in place of *Because* [Quia].
[3] Cf. Aristotle, Periher., Bk. II, ch. 1 (ch. 19) and the Commentary of (St. Severinus) Boethius on this passage, where he says: For it is the same to understand what is said (to be) "unjust", as if it were said (to be) "not just". — A little below with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted *Holy* [sanctus].

[4] Question 2 and 8. See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 4.
[5] We follow many of the codices by placing *differently* [differenter] in place of *they differ* [differunt]; supply: it does befit each.

---

p. 239

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus dici potest ingenitus in sensu privativo, non autem, quatenus ingenitus est notio Patris.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit can be said (to be) “unbegotten” in the privative sense, but not, to the extent that “unbegotten” is the notion (belonging) to the Father.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod aliqui voluerunt[1] distinguere de hoc nomine *ingenitum*, quod potest scribi per unum *n*, et sic tantum valet quantum *increatum*; vel per duo, et sic opponitur ei quod est *genitum* proprie dictum. Sed haec distinctio, etsi valeat apud Graecos, non tamen valet apud Latinos, quia *ingenitum* per duo *n* est vox non significativa apud nos. Damascenus[2] autem assignat hanc differentiam in lingua sua, quia Graecus erat. *Praeterea*, non valet ad propositum; quia nihil quaeritur hic de ingenito, prout tantum valet quantum *increatum*, sed prout tantum valet quantum *non genitum* sive innascibile.

I respond: It must be said, that some wanted[1] to distinguish concerning this name “*unbegotten*”, which can be written with one (initial) *n*, and thus means only as much as “*unbegotten*” (does); and/or with two (initial n’s), and thus is opposed to that which has been properly said (to be) “*begotten”*. But this distinction, even if it is valid among the Greeks, it not valid, however, among the Latins, because *unbegotten* [ingenitum] with two (initial) *n’s* is not a meaningful word in our language [vox non significativa apud nos]. (St. John) Damascene,[2] however, assigns this difference in his own language, because he was a Greek. *Moreover*, it is not a valid (argument) for the proposed; because nothing here is asked concerning “unbegotten”, insofar as it means only as much as *uncreated* (does), but insofar as it means only as much as “*not begotten”* or “innascible” (does).

Et propterea aliter dicendum est, et brevitur, quod *ingenitum*, uno modo *pure* accipitur *privative*, scilicet quod non generatur;[3] et hoc modo dicitur de Spiritu sancto et de essentia; alio modo, prout ingenitum tantum valet quantum *non ens ab alio* et[4] *a quo alii*; et hoc modo dicit notionem solius Patris, quia dicit proprietatem et dignitatem in Patre. Et secundum primum sensum loquitur Hieronymus, secundum alium loquitur Augustinus. Unde autem habeant ortum isti sensus, et quare *innascibilis* sit notio et non *improcessibilis*, infra dicetur.[5]

And on this account it must be said in another manner, and briefly, that “*unbegotten*”, in one manner is accepted *purely privatively*, that is, as ‘that which is not generated’;[3] and in this manner it is said of the Holy Spirit and of the Essence; in another manner, insofar as “unbegotten” means only as much as a “*not being from Another*” and[4] a “*from whom the Others (come forth)*”; and in this manner it means the notion of the Father alone, because it means a property and dignity in the Father. And according to the first sense (St.) Jerome speaks, according to the other (St.) Augustine speaks. Whence, moreover, these senses have (their) rise, and for what

reason “*innascible*” is a notion and “*improcessible*” (is) not, will be spoken of below.[5]

Ex his patet solutio *contrarietatis*; patent etiam obiecta.

From these is clear the solution to the *contrariness* (of usages); the objections are also clear.

Quod ergo obiicitur, quod negatio cum constantia subiecti aequipollet termino privativo, verum est, si sit *mere*[6] privativum; sed illa ratio concludit solum de hoc nomine secundum quod *privat*, non secundum quod aliquid *ponit*.

What, therefore, is objected, that a negation with a constancy of subject is equipollent to a privative term, it is true, if it is *merely*[6] a privative one; but that reckoning concludes only concerning this name according to which *it is privative*, not according to which it *posits* anything.

Ad illud quod obiicitur, aut praedicat[7] essentiam, aut relationem; dicendum, quod secundum quod dicitur de essentia, solum privative sive negative tenetur. Et ideo non praedicat aliquid, sicut quando dicitur: essentia non generat. Cetera alia[8] manifesta sunt.

To that which is objected, ‘it either predicates[7] the Essence, or a relation’; it must be said, that according to which it is said of the Essence, it is held only privatively or negatively. And for that reason it does not predicate anything, just as where there is said: ‘the Essence does not generate’, (nothing else is meant). All the others[8] have been made manifest.

SCHOLION.

I. Haec quaestio orta esse videtur ex diverso modo loquendi, quo in hac re SS. Doctores Augustinus et Hieronymus usi sunt. S. Bonav. duas istorum sententias apte conciliat. Plurima de ratione innascilibitatis habentur infra d. 28. per totam.

II. Quoad ordinem solutionem ad opposita notandum, quod verba in fine corporis: « patent obiecta » referuntur ad 1. 2. 4. pro parte affirmativa. Deinde explicite solvit argum. 3. pro affimr.; et ultimo respondet ad distinctionem in 2. pro parte negativa.

III. Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 69. m. 3. — Scot., hic q. unic. et d. 28. q. 2. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 4; S. I. q. 33. a. 4. — B. Albert., hic a. 8. seq. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 3. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 4. — Aegid R., hic 2. princ. q. 2. — Durand., hic q. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3.

SCHOLIUM

I. This question seems to have arisen from the diverse manner of speaking, which the most holy Doctors (Sts.) Augustine and Jerome used. St. Bonaventure aptly reconciles their two sentences. Much more concerning the reckoning of innascibility is had below in d. 28, throughout.

II. In regard to the order of the solution for the objections, it must be noted, that the words at the end of the body (of the response): « the objections are also clear » refer to nn. 1, 2, and 4, (and support) the affirmative side. Then he explicitly solves argument n. 3 for the affirmative; and lastly, he responds to the distinction in the 2nd for the negative.

III. Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 69, m. 3. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in the q. sole, and in d. 28, q. 2. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 4; Summa, I, q. 33, a. 4. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 8 ff. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 3, a. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here in q. 4. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 2. — Durandus, here in q. 3. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3.

---

[1] In cod. V additur *dicere sive*.
[2] Libr. I. de Fide orthod. c. 8: Sciendum enim vocem □□□□□□□□, cum scribitur cum unico □, increatum

[1] In codex V there is added *to say or* [dicere sive].
[2] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 8: For it must be known that the word □□□□□□□□, when it is written

significare seu quod minime factum est; □□□□□□□□□ autem, cum scribitur cum duplici □□, id indicare quod non est genitum.

[3] Vat. minus distincte, et mss. cum ed. 1 refragantibus, *quod ingenitum dicitur uno modo, prout accipitur privative, scilicet pro eo quod non generatur*.

[4] Cod. K *quantum ens non ab alio, sed*.

[5] Dist. 28. per totam.

[6] Multi codd. ut A G H I S T U V W X etc. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 minus bene *vere* loco *mere*, ed. 1 autem *pure*.

[7] Plurimi codd. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, incongrue *privat* loco *praedicat*.

[8] Ex mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *alia*.

with one □□(in the middle), signifies "uncreated" or "that which is least of all made", but □□□□□□□□□□, when it is written with two □□ (in the middle), indicates "that which is not begotten".

[3] The Vatican edition less distinctly, and in disagreement with the manuscripts together with edition 1, reads *that "unbegotten" is said in one manner, insofar as it is accepted privatively, that is, for "that which is not generated"*.

[4] Codex K reads *as much as a being not from another, but* [*quantum ens non ab alio, sed*].

[5] Distinction 28, throughout.

[6] Many codices, such as A G H I S T U V W X etc., together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, have less well *truly* [vere] in place of *merely* [mere], but edition one substitutes with *purely* [pure].

[7] Very many codices together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, incongruously have *deprives* [privat] in place of *predicates* [praedicat].

[8] From the manuscripts and editin 1, we have supplied *the others* [alia].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIII.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 239-241.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIII

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 239-241.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Dub. I.

In presente distinctione sunt dubitationes

Doubt I

In the present distinction there are doubts

circa litteram, et primo dubitatur de ratione Augustini, quam ponit ibi: *Si Spiritus sanctus Filius diceretur, amborum utique Filius diceretur*; et videtur sua ratio magis ad oppositum quam ad propositum: ex hoc enim similiter esset generatio in creaturis, quae est ex duobus.

about the text, and first there is a doubt about the reckoning of (St.) Augustine, which he posits there: *If the Holy Spirit would be said (to be) the Son, Each indeed would be said (to be) the Son*, and his reckoning seems more for the opposed (argument) than for the proposed: for from this similarly, there would be among creatures a generation, which is out of two.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod quamvis similior sit quantum ad dualitatem producentium, non tamen quantum ad modum producendi posset esse similitudo, quia sic oporteret, quod altera personarum esset principium passivum; quantum autem ad hoc nulla[9] potest esse similitudo.

I respond: It must be said, that although it is more similar as much as regards the duality of (those) producing, there could not, however, as much as regards the manner of producing, be a similitude, because in this manner it would have to be [oporteret], that the Other of the two Persons be a passive principle; but as much as regard this, there can be no[9] similitude.

Dub. II.

Doubt II

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Idem Spiritus sanctus procedit quomodo datus vel donum*; quia videtur male dicere, quia cum non sit datus nisi ex tempore, videtur quod non procedat nisi ex tempore.

Likewise is asked of this which he says. *Likewise the Holy Spirit proceeds . . . in the manner which (one is) born and/or as the Gift*; because it seems that he speaks badly, because since He has not been given, except in time, it seems that He does not proceed except in time.

Respondeo: Sicut infra patebit,[10] si intelligitur de processione temporali, *datus* dicit actum; si autem de aeterna, *datus* dicit aptitudinem.

I respond: Just as will be clear below,[10] if one understands it of the temporal procession, *given* means the act; but if of the eternal (procession), *given* means the aptitude.

---

[9] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *nulla* loco *non*.
[10] Dist. 14. a. 1. q. 1.

[9] Trusting in very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *no* [nulla] in place of *not* [non].
[10] Distinction 14, a. 1, q. 1.

p. 240

Dub. III.

Doubt III

Unde Augustinus Maximino praemissam quaestionem refricanti.[1] Maximinus refricabat dictam quaestionem sic: Spiritus sanctus est Deus, et non est Deus nascendo: ergo non Deus naturaliter: ergo adoptive. Et quod hoc argumentum sit bonum, videtur, quia quod inest alicui naturaliter, inest ei a nativitate: ergo quod non inest a nativitate, non inest naturaliter: ergo cum Spiritus sanctus non procedat ut natus, non inest ei esse Deum a nativitate: ergo non est Deus naturaliter.

Whence (St.) Augustine responding thus to Maximinus, warming up again the aforementioned question. Maximinus warmed up the said question in this manner: 'The Holy Spirit is God, and is not God by being born: therefore not God naturally: therefore adoptively'. And that this argument is good, seems, because what is in anything naturally, is in it from (its) nativity: therefore what is not in it from (its) nativity, is not in it naturally: therefore since the Holy Spirit does not proceed as one born, there is not in Him from a nativity

‘that He is God’: therefore He is not God naturally.

Et est responsio Augustini ad hoc,[2] quod argumentum istud non valet, nisi in eis quae generantur, in aliis non. Et hoc patet, quia Adam erat homo natura, sicut unusquisque nostrum, et tamen ipse habuit per creationem, quod nos habemus per generationem; sic Deus Pater communicat naturam suam Spiritui sancto per spirationem, sicut Filio per generationem.

And the response of (St.) Augustine to this[2] is, that that argument of his is not valid, except among those which are generated, among others (it is) not. And this is clear, because Adam was a man by nature, just as each of us (are), and yet had through being created [creationem], that which we have through being generated [generationem]; thus God the Father communicates His own Nature to the Holy Spirit through spiration, just as to the Son through generation.

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Pater processionis eius est auctor*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia aut hoc quod est *auctor* dicit *essentiam*, aut *notionem*: non *essentiam*, quia tunc diceretur de Spiritu sancto; si *notionem*, quaero, *quam ?* non innascibilitatem, quia illa non dicit respectum ad processionem; item, non generationem nec spiratione, quia nihil esset dictum, ut videtur. — Item quaeritur, utrum Pater possit dici *auctor* generationis ? Et quod *non*, videtur, quia Pater dicitur auctor Filii, ergo, sicut supra dixit Hilarius et habetur distinctione nona,[3] sensus est: id est *genitor Filii*, ergo tunc idem esset dicere, *est auctor generationis*, quod *genitor*.

Doubt IV

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *The Father is the author of His generation*. For it seems that he speaks badly, because either ‘that which is *author*’ means *the Essence*, or *a notion*: not *the Essence*, because then it would be said of the Holy spirit; if *a notion*, I ask, *which?* not innascibility, because that one does not mean a looking-back to the procession; likewise, not generation nor spiration, because nothing (then) would be said, as it seems (to be). — Likewise there is asked, whether the Father could be said (to be) the *author* of the generation? And that (He could) *not*, seems, because the Father is said (to be) the Author of the Son, therefore, just as (St.) Hilary said above and is had in the Ninth Distinction,[3] the sense (of this) is, that He is the *Genitor of the Son*, therefore it would then be the same to say, ‘*He is the author of the generation*’, (and) that ‘*(He is) the Genitor (of it)*’.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *auctor* dicit in Patre fontalem plenitudinem, quia ipse non est ab alio, sed alii ab ipso; et inde dicit, ut credo, eandem notionem, quam dicit innascibilis, sed differenti modo: quia *innascibilis* dicit[4] per privationem prioris, sed *auctor* dicit fecunditatem et plenitudinem respectu procedentium ab ipso, quam habet non aliunde; et ideo dicitur *auctor* ab *auctoritate*. Auctoritas autem est in Patre, quia quod habet, ab alio non habet, et hoc est, quod est[5] *innascibilis*; et ita patet, quod potest dici auctor omnium personarum, quae sunt ab ipso. Ex his patet responsio. Dico enim, quod dicit eandem notionem quam innascibilitatis, sed alio modo. Ex hoc patet, quod nunquam dicitur Filius auctor spirationis, quamvis

I respond: It must be said, that “*author*” means in the Father “fontal plenitude”, because He Himself is not from another, but the Others (are) from Him; and hence it means, as I believe, the same notion as “innascible” means, but in a different manner: because *innascible* means (the notion) [4] through a privation of (what is) prior, but *author* means a fecundity and plenitude in respect of (those) proceeding from Him, which He has from nowhere else; and for that reason there is said *author* from *authorship*. Moreover authorship is in the Father, because what He has, He does not have from another, and this is, what *innascible* is,[5] and thus it is clear, that He can be said (to be) “the Author of all the Persons, which are from Him”. From these

spiret, quia non habet a se, se ab alio; unde *auctor* proprie dicitur principium alterius non ab alio.[6]

(considerations) the response is clear. For I say, that it means the same notion as innascibility, but in another manner. From this it is clear, that the Son is never said (to be) "the Author of the spiration", though He does spirate, because He does not have (this) from Himself, but from Another; whence an "*author*" properly is said (to be) "a principle of the other, not from another".[6]

Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Distinguere inter illam generationem et istam processionem nescio*. Videtur enim talis ignorantia esse peccatum, quia disctinctio personarum de necessitate est fidei et salutis, sed qui ignorat ea quae sunt de necessitate fidei, damnabiliter ignorat: ergo etc.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod duplex[7] est *scire*, scilicet, *si est* et *sicuti est*. *Scire si est*; hoc modo certitudinaliter credere distinctionem de necessitate salutis est, large sumto *scire*. *Scire* autem *sicuti est* non pertinet ad statum meritti, sed praemii; et de hac scientia loquitur hic Magister et Augustinus. Et nota, quod tria dicit: *nescio* quantum ad habitum scientiae; *non valeo*, quantum ad ingenium; *non sufficio*, quantum ad utrumque.[8]

Doubt V

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *How to distinguish between that generation and this procession I know not*. For it seems that such ignorance is a sin, because the distinction of the Persons of necessity belongs to the Faith and to salvation, but he who is ignorant of those things which of necessity belong to the Faith, is damnably ignorant: ergo etc..

I respond: It must be said, that *to know* [scire] is twofold, that is, "*if it is*" and "*just as it is*". "*To know if it is*"; in this manner is to believe with certitude [certitudinaliter] that the distinction of necessity belongs to salvation, having taken *to know* in the broad sense. But "*to know just as it is*" does not pertain to the state of merit, but (rather to the state) of reward; and of this knowledge [scientia] Master (Peter) speaks here, and (St.) Augstine (too). And note, that he says three (things): *I know not* as much as regards the habit of science; *I am not able*, as much as regards (his own) genius; *I do not suffice*, as much as regards each.[8]

Dub. VI.

Item obiicitur de hoc quod dicit: *Appellatur ingenitus, non quidem in Scripturis, sed in consuetudine disputantium*. *Contra*: Dionysius:[9] « Non . . .

Doubt VI

Likewise is objected concerning this which he says: *He is named "unbegotten", not indeed in the Scriptures, but in the custom of (those) disputing*. *On the contrary*: (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite says):[9] « One must not . . .

---

[1] Scil. denuo vel instanter *quaerenti, cur Spiritus sanctus non diceretur Filius, cum de Patris esset substantia*. Verba ex lit. Magistri, c. 3. Cfr. August., II. contra Maximin. c. 14. et 15. — Mss. et ed. 1 perperam *refutanti* pro *refricanti*, sicuti et mox *refutabat* loco *refricabat*; Vat. omittit verba *Maximinus* usque *sic*.

[2] Vat. absque mss. et ed. 1 auctoritate *Resp. Dicendum ad hoc secundum Augustinum*. Plures codd. inepte *ratio* loco *responsio*.

[3] In lit. Magistri, c. 4. circa finem. — Vat., mss. cum ed. 1 obnitentibus, *et* loco *ergo*, deinde omittit *et habetur distinctione nona*.

---

[1] That is, a second time and/or urgently *to the one asking, why the Holy Spirit should not be said (to be) the Son, since He is from the substance of the Father*. The words are from the text of Master (Peter), ch. 3. Cf. (St.) Augustine, Against Maximinus, Bk. II, ch. 14 and 15. — The manuscripts and edition 1 faultily have *refuting* [refutanti] for *warming up again* [refricanti], just as they also next have *refuted* [refutabat] for *warmed up* [refricabat]; the Vatican edition omits the words *Maximinus . . . in this manner:*.

[2] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, has *I respond: It must be*

[4] Supple: notionem; quam suppletionem non attendendo Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 omittit *per*.
[5] Aliqui codd. ut A T X Z aa bb omittunt *est*, qui et cum ed. 1 *quia* loco *quod* substituunt.
[6] In ultimis hisce verbis summa solutionis continetur. Quia enim *auctor* non dicit quodlibet principium emanationis, sed tale principium, quod quidquid habet, ab alio non habet, et quia hoc solum Patri convenit; ideo Pater dici potest auctor generationis et processionis. Idem infra d. 27. p. 1. q. 2. ad 3. fusius exponitur, ubi inter alia S. Doctor haec dicit: Quoniam igitur ratio primitatis in aliquo genere est ratio principiati in illo, ideo quia Pater est primum respectu emanationis, generationis et processionis, generat et spirat. Cfr. etiam d. 2. q. 2, d. 9. dub. 11, et d. 15. p. 2. dub. 6. — Quomodo Pater possit dicit *auctor* explicatur et a S. Fulgentio, Fragment. 35. (ed. Migne; Patrol. Lat. tom. 65. col. 822), ubi ait: Deus quippe Pater non est auctor Trinitatis, sed acutor est Filii et Spiritus sancti, in eo quod de illo natus est Filius et de illo procedit Spiritus sanctus. Nam quisqus recte intelligit auctoris vocabulum, relationis nomen inveniet, non naturae. Auctor enim nemo esse dicitur sibi, sed alteri: unde non ad se ipsum, sed ad alterum auctor veraciter nuncupatur. Nemo autem quolibet relativo nomine sic potest ad suam sicut ad alterius referri personam . . . Deum itaque Patrem non totius Trinitatis, sed Filii et Spiritus sancti fatemur auctorem: de quo habet et unigenitus Filius aeternae nativitatis, et Spiritus sanctus aeternae processionis originem.
[7] Ed. 1 *dupliciter*.
[8] De hac ultima divisione vide supra d. 1. a. 1. q. 1. fundam. 3.
[9] De Div. Nom. c. 1, in quo textu Vat. contra multos codd. et ed. 1 necnon ed. oper. Dionysii *Trinitate* loco *divinitate*.

said to this, according to (St.) Augustine [Resp. Dicendum ad hoc secundum Augustinum]. Very many codices ineptly have *the reckoning* [ratio] in place of *the response* [responsio].
[3] In the text of Master (Peter), ch. 4 near the end. — The Vatican edition, disagreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1, has *and* [et] in place of *therefore* [ergo], then it omits *and is had in the Ninth Distinction* [et habetur distinctione nona].
[4] Supply: the notion; the Vatican edition, by not attending to this understanding, contrary to nearly all the codices and editions, omits *through* [per].
[5] Some codices, such as A T X Z aa and bb, omit *is* [est], which also with edition 1 substitute *because* [quia] in place of *what* [quod].
[6] In these very last words the summation of the solution is contained. For because *author* [auctor] does not mean "any principle of an emanation", but "such a principle, that whatever it does have, it has not from another", and because this befits the Father alone, for that reason the Father can be said (to be) the Author of the generation (of the Son) and of the procession (of the Holy Spirit). The same is expounded more at length in d. 27, p. I, q. 2, in reply to n. 3, where among other things the Seraphic Doctor says this: Therefore since the reckoning of primacy in any genus is the reckoning of the one begun in it, for that reason because the Father is first in respect to the emanation, generation and procession, He generates and spirates. Cf. also d. 2, q. 2, d. 9, dubium 11, and d. 15, p. II, dubium 6. — In which manner the Father can be said (to be) *author* is explained also by St. Fulgentius, Fragment. 35 (Migne's, Patrologia Latina, tome 65, col. 822), where he says: Indeed, God the Father is not the Author of the Trinity, but He is the Author of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in this that from Him the Son is born and from Him the Holy Spirit does proceed. For whoever rightly understands the word "author", will find a name belonging to relation, not to nature. For no one is said to be an "author" of himself, but of the other: whence one is truly named "author" not as regards himself, but as regards the other. Moreover, no one can by any relative name in this manner refer to his own person just as to the other's . . .. And so we say that God the Father (is) the Author, not of the whole Trinity, but of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: from whom one has the origin both of the eternal nativity of the Only-Begotten Son, and of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit.
[7] Edition 1 has *in a twofold manner* [dupliciter].
[8] On this last division see above d. 1, a. 1, q. 1, fundament 3.
[9] On the Divine Names, ch. 1, in which text the Vatican edition, contrary to many codices and to edition 1, and to the works of (St.) Dionysius, has *Trinity* [Trinitate] in place of *divinity* [divinitate].

_p. 241_

est audendum aliquid dicere de illa supersubstantiali et sancta divinitate praeter ea quae divinitus nobis ex sacris

dare to say anything of that supersubstantial and holy Divinity except those which have been divinely made clear

eloquiis claruerunt »: ergo male fecerunt qui hoc nomen invenerunt.

[claruerunt] to us from the sacred discourses »: therefore they have done badly, who have invented this name.

Respondeo: Quamvis istud verbum non dicatur in Scripturis, dicitur tamen verbi huius intellectus. Et quia verbum non est profanum nec errori coniunctum, cum intellectus veri ex Scriptura et fide habeatur, non fuit contra fas illud Deo attribuere, ut ipsam Trinitatem conferendo[1] apertius possimus intelligere.

I respond: Though that word of theirs is not said in the Scriptures, yet (that which has been) understood by this word is said. And because the word is not profane nor conjoined with error, since the understanding of (its) true (sense) is had from Scripture and by the Faith, it was not against the divine law [contra fas] to attribute it to God, so that by conferring (this name upon Him)[1] we could more openly understand the Trinity Itself.

Dub. VII.

Doubt VII

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Magister: *Et aliter Augustinus accipit ingenitum, qui vel quod non est ab alio, quod dicit convenire soli Patri*. Sed hoc non videtur verum, quia hoc modo *ingenitum* convenit essentiae: ergo non est Patris proprium.

Likewise is asked of this which Master (Peter) says: *And in another manner (St.) Augustine accepts "unbegotten", as 'one who' and/or 'as something which' ' is not from another'; which means that it befits the Father alone*. But this does not seem to be true, because in this manner *unbegotten* befits the Essence: therefore it is not proper to the Father.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod licet Magister dicat intellectum Augustini, tamen non totum.[2] *Ingenitum* enim, secundum quod dicitur proprietas Patris, privat *esse ab alio*, nec hoc sufficit ad hoc, ut sit notio, nisi etiam consequenter dicat, quod alius sit ab ipso; quia, sicut obiectum est, *non esse ab alio* sive *non generari* convenit essentiae.[3]

I respond: It must be said, that though Master (Peter) says (what is) understood by (St.) Augustine, yet (He does) not (say it) entirely.[2] For *unbegotten*, according to which there is meant a property of the Father, is lacking "*being*" *from another*, not is it sufficient for this, that it be a notion, unless it also consequently means, "that the other is from Him"; because, just as has been objected, "*not being from another*" or "*not being generated*" befits the Essence.[3]

Dub. VIII.

Doubt VIII

Item contra hoc quod dicit Hieronymus: *Est quod natum est, et factum non est*, obiicit Arius, quod duodecim sint modi generationis, quorum quolibet dato, sequitur, quod Filius non tantum natus, sed etiam factus est; et hos modos ponit disputans contra Victorinum.[4] *Primus* modus est per defluxum lineae a puncto. *Secundus* est penes emissionem radii a sole vel ab alio luminoso corpore. *Tertius* est penes sigillationem characteris, sicut figura fit in cera a sigillo. *Quartus* est penes immisionem, ut quando a Deo datur bona voluntas. *Quintus* est penes exitum proprietatis vel accidentis a principiis subiecti, quae sunt materia et forma. *Sextus* est penes intentionis sive speciei

Likewise against this which (St.) Jerome says: *There is that which is born, and is not made*, Arius objects, that there are twelve manners of generation, of which, if any be admitted [quolibet dato], it follows, that the Son not only is born, but also made; and he posits these manner, disputing against (Caius Marius) Victorinus (Afer).[4] *The first* manner is through the flowing-down of a line from a point. *The second* is in and through [penes] the emission of a ray from the Sun and/or from another luminous body. *The third* is in and through the sealing of a character, just as a figure is made in wax by a seal [sigillo]. *The fourth* is in and through immission, as when good will is given by God. *The fifth* is in and through the going-

abstractionem, sicut species rerum generatur in anima. *Septimus* est penes excitationem, sicut liberum arbitrium excitatum a gratia procedit in bona opera. *Octavus* est penes transfigurationem, sicut ex aere fit statua, vel sicut in figura incisionis. *Novus* est penes productionem, sicut a primo movente immobili producitur motus. *Decimus* est penes exitus specierum de[5] genere per differentias dividentes genus et constituentes speciem. *Undecimus* est penes ideatione, sicut arca exterior ab arca, quae est in ment artificis. *Duodecimus* est penes nascentiam, ut homo generatur ab homine. Quocumque autem praedictorum modorum generetur Filius, non tantum genitus,[6] sed etiam factus est.

forth of a property and/or an accident from the principles of a subject, which are matter and form. *The sixth* is in and through the abstraction of intention or species, just as the species of things is generated in the soul. *The seventh* is in and through excitation, just as free will [liberum arbitrium] excited by grace proceeds into good works. *The eighth* is in and through transfiguration, just as an image [staua] comes to be in the clouds [ex aere], and/or just as (one comes to be) in the figure of a tattoo [incisionis]. *The ninth* is in and through production, just as from a prime, immobile, mover movement is produced. *The tenth* is in and through the going-forth of species from[5] a genus through the differences dividing the genus and constituting the species. *The eleventh* is in and through being born [nascentiam], as a man is generated from a man. But in whatsoever of the aforesaid manners the Son is generated, He is[6] not only born, but also made.

Ad hoc est responsio, quia aut Arius accipit generationem *communiter* ad creatam et divinam, aut *specialiter* in creatura. Si *communiter*, dico, quod insufficienter dividit, quia ultra istos modos est generatio Filii a Patre secundum modum signularem, qui[7] est de tota substantia generantis —sicut supra dictum fuit nona distinctione[8] —ubi, quia non potest esse mutatio, nullo modo potest esse factio. Si autem dividat generationem, ut est in ceaturis, dicendum, quod divisio illa insufficiens est adhuc, quia omittit generationem aequivocam, quae est secundum[9] putrefationem. Sed esto quod comprehendat eam sub generatione, quae est secundum nascentiam, tamen adhuc non valet ad propositum, quod, si non generatur, sicut creatura dicitur generari, nullo modo generatur. Quamvis enim creatura sit Deo similis, tamen plus est dissimilis quam similis, sicut dicit Augustinus decimo quinto de Trinitate,[10] et Hilarius[11] similiter: « Omnis comparatio inferiorum plus habetur hominibus utilis quam Deo apta »; et ideo haeretici erraverunt, quia[12] credebant, omnino esse in Deo, sicut videbant in creatura. Et hoc bene tangitur in Glossa super primum ad Hebraeos,[13] ubi dicitur: « Non possunt temporalia comparari aeternis integra

To this the response is, that either Arius accepts “generation” *commonly* as regards created and divine, or *specially* in the creature. If *commonly*, I say, that he divides it insufficiently, because beyond those manners (of which he speaks) there is the generation of the Son from the Father —according to a singular manner, which[7] is “from the whole substance of the one generating” — just as had been said above in the Ninth Distinction[8] —where, because there cannot be a change, there can be in no manner a making. Moreover if he divides generation, as it is among creatures, it must be said, that that division is still insufficient, because it omits equivocal generation, which is according to[9] putrefaction. But granted [esto] that he does comprehend that under generation, which is according to being born, however it still is not valid for the proposed, because, if He is not generated, as a creature is said to be generated, He is in no manner generated. For though a creature be similar to God, yet it is more dissimilar than similar, just as (St.) Augustine says in the fifteenth (book) On the Trinity,[10] and (St.) Jerome[11] similarly: « Every comparison of inferiors is held (to be) more useful to men, than apt to God »; and for that reason the heretics

collatione, sed aliqua tenui similitudine »; et ideo, sicut supra ostensum est,[14] secundum diversas conditiones diversae generationes illam repraesentant. Ratione enim *conformitatis* est similis generationi verbi a mente; ratione *coaevitatis* similis generationi splendoris de sole sive de luce; ratione *aequalitatis* generationi viventis de vivente.[15]

erred, because[12] they used to believe, that it is entirely in God, just as they saw it in the creature. And this is well touched upon in the Gloss on the first (chapter of the Letter) to the Hebrews,[13] where there is said: « Temporals cannot be compared to eternals by a integral collation, but by some tenuous similitude »; and for that reason, just as has been shown above,[14] according to diverse conditions the diverse generations represent that one. For by a reckoning *of conformity* it is similar to the generation of a word from a mind; and by a reckoning *of coevity* (it is) similar to the generation of the splendor from the Sun or from a light; by the reckoning of *equality* (it is similar) to the generation of a living (thing) from a living (thing).[15]

---

[1] Cod. Y *confitendo*.
[2] Aliqui codd. ut H M ff cum ed. 1 satis bene addunt *dicit*. Mox codd. aa bb *est* loco *dicitur*; ed 1 *dicit proprietatem*.
[3] De significatione *ingeniti* vide infra d. 28. q. 1, et hic q. 4.
[4] Vat. contra plurimos codd. et ed. 1 falso *Victorianum*. Marius Victorinus Rhetor (cf. supra d. 1. a. 1. q. 1. in corp.) scripsit libros quatuor contra Arium et disputabat cum Candido, defensore Arii, qui in libro de Generatione divina, n. 4. duodecim istos modos generationis proponebat.
[5] Fide mss. et trium primarum edd. substituimus *de* loco *in*.
[6] In Vat. additur *est*, quod tamen nec in mss nec in 1, 2, 3, 6 edd. habetur.
[7] Multi mss. ut A F G H K T V W etc. loco *qui* habent *quae*, quod refertur ad *generatio*. Ed. 1 *significatum* pro *singularem*.
[8] Quaest. 1. — Mox ed. 1 transponit verba legendo *quia ubi*.
[9] Ed. 1 *per*.
[10] Cap. 20. n. 39.
[11] Libr. I. de Trin. n. 19. — Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1, interpunctione mutata, confundit omnia legens *et Hilarius. Similiter cum omnis* etc.
[12] Praeferimus lectionem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 ponendo *quia* loco *qui*. Mox cod E post *omnino* addit *simile*.
[13] Vers. 3. Glossam vide apud Lyranum, super locum cit., in qua post *tenui* additur *et parva*.
[14] Dist. 9. q. 1. et dub. 10.
[15] Cfr. Hex. Serm. 11. Fere idem invenies in Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 42. m. 5. a. 3; B. Albert., hic a. 5; Richard. hic circa lit.

---

[1] Codex Y has instead *by confessing (this name)* [confitendo].
[2] Some codices, such as H M and ff together with edition 1, sufficiently well add the *He does . . . say it* [dicit]. Then codices aa and bb have *it is* [est] in place of *there is meant* [dicitur]; edition 1 has *it means a property* [dicit proprietatem].
[3] On the signification of *unbegotten*, see below d. 28, q. 1, and here in q. 4.
[4] The Vatican edition, contrary to very many codices and edition 1, falsely has *Victorianus*. Marius Victorinus, the Rhetor (cf. above d. 1, a. 1, q. 1, in the body of the response), wrote four books against Arius, and disputed with Candid, a defendor of Arius, who in his own book On the Divine Generation, n. 4, proposed these twelve manners of generation.
[5] Trusting in the manuscripts and in three first editions, we have substituted *from* [de] in place of *in* [in].
[6] In the Vatican edition (in the first clause) there is had an *is* [est: transferred to the first clause, from the second, according to English usage], which, however, is not had in either the manuscripts, nor in editions 1, 2, 3, and 6.
[7] Many manuscripts, such as A F G H K T V W etc., in place of *which (manner)* [qui] have *which (generation)* [quae]. Edition 1 has *signified* [significatum] for *singular* [singularem].
[8] Question 1. — Then edition 1 transposes the words by reading *because, where* [quia ubi].
[9] Edition 1 has *through* [per] instead of *according to* [secundum].
[10] Chapter 20, n. 39.
[11] On the Trinity, Bk. I, n. 10. — The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, with a changed punctuation, confounds everything by reading *and (St.) Hilary. Similarly when every* etc. [et Hilarius. Similiter cum omnis etc.].
[12] We prefer the reading of the more ancient manuscripts and of edition 1, by placing *because they* [quia] in place of *who* [qui]. Then codex E after *entirely* [omnino] adds *similar* [simile].

[13] Verse 3. See the Gloss in (Nicolas) of Lyra, on the passage cited, in which after *tenuous* [tenui] there is added *and tiny* [parva].
[14] Distinction 9, q. 1, and dubium 10.
[15] Cf. Hexaëmeron, Sermon 11. You can find nearly the same words in Alexander of Hales, Summa, p I, q. 42, m. 5, a. 3; in Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus' Commentary), here in a. 5, and in Richard (of Middletown), here on the text (of Master Peter).